VOL. XIII, No. 1 JANUARY, 1935

THE CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY

Editor:- ALBERT PEEL, M.A., LITT.D

A REVIEW OF RELIGIOUS LIFE AND THOUGHT

Published by INDEPENDENT PRESS LTD. for
THE CONGREGATIONAL UNION OF ENGLAND AND WALES,
MEMORIAL HALL, LONDON, E.C. 4.

Price Two Shillings & Sixpence net.

For Contents see page V.

The L.M.S. is Responsible

for the
EVANGELIZATION OF
35,000,000
PEOPLE.

The Deliberate Policy

of the Society is to
TAKE CHRIST
to these waiting millions.

Contributions should be sent to:
The Home Secretary,

London Missionary Society

Livingstone House, Broadway, Westminster,
London, S.W.1.

The Congregational Quarterly

Editor:
ALBERT PEEL, M.A., LITT.D.

Editorial Board:
Rev. DOUGLAS HORTON, D.D. | Rev. E. J. PRICE, M.A., B.D.
Mr. B. L. MANNING, M.A. | Rev. W. B. SELBIE, M.A., D.D.
Mr. HAROLD SHEPHEARD, M.A.

The Congregational Union of England and Wales is not responsible for opinions expressed in these pages, nor is the Editor responsible for the views of contributors.

THE CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY is published on the 20th of March, June, September, and December, each quarter, by the Publication Department of the Congregational Union of England and Wales. It may be obtained from the publishers at 2s. 6d. a copy (plus postage), or 10s. per annum post free, or from any bookseller at 2s. 6d.

All contributions (typewritten where possible) should be addressed to the Editor at Shirley, Russell Road, Buckhurst Hill, Essex, with stamped envelope for return in case of non-acceptance.

Vol. XIII, No. 1 JANUARY, 1935

CONTENTS.

[For biographical sketches of the contributors see p. vii.]

		PAGE
EDITORIAL		1
DUFF AND "UNITED"	E. GRIFFITH-JONES	9
WHY THE CHURCH?	F. C. GRANT	11
WHITTIER FACE TO FACE	JOHN WRIGHT BUCKHAM	23
THE PANOPLY OF PAUL	W. D. DAVIES	27
EXPRESSION IN ENGLISH PSALMODY	ORLANDO A. MANSFIELD	39
A PLEA FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF CHURCH UNION IN SOUTH INDIA	G. E. PHILLIPS	47
SOME ISSUES CONFRONTING THE MINISTRY TO-DAY	EDMUND B. CHAFFEE	54
A NEW OUTLOOK IN CHRISTIAN MISSIONS	H. A. POPLEY	61
SHAKESPEARE'S RELIGION	E. S. OAKLEY	68
DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS—		
THE CRISIS OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY	E. G. HOMRIGHAUSEN	71
RE-THINKING MISSIONS	WILLIAM BAND	75
CHURCH OVERDRAFTS	A BANKER	80
A CONSTRUCTIVE COMRADESHIP	J. EMRYS MORGAN	82
FOR, BUT ALSO BY, THE YOUNG	A. GRAHAM ELDRIDGE	85
THE CHILDREN'S SERMON	JOHN ADAMS	88
ON LIFE AND BOOKS—		
THE WHOLE—AND NOTHING BUT	ALBERT PEEL	92
WORTH NOTING. FROM RECENT BOOKS		102
FOREIGN REVIEWS. By Dr. A. E. GARVIE		104
CURRENT LITERATURE. By the EDITOR, Drs. C. J. CADOUX, H. WHEELER ROBINSON, SYDNEY CAVE, W. B. SELBIE, ROBERT S. FRANKS, and Mr. B. L. MANNING, M.A.		106
SHORTER NOTICES. By the EDITOR, the Revs. E. J. PRICE, M.A., B.D., A. T. S. JAMES, B.A., M.Sc., and Mr. A. BOYCE GIBSON, M.A.		123
PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS		143

(Made and Printed in Great Britain.)

48053 1935

IN THE STEPS OF THE MASTER
by H. V. MORTON

Dr. F. W. NORWOOD, of the City Temple:
"THE GREATEST OF HIS CHARACTERISTIC TRAVEL BOOKS . . . MR. MORTON'S TOUCH IS DELICATE AND DISCRIMINATING. IT IS REVERENT AND NEVER PROPAGANDIST . . . HE TAKES HIS READERS WHEREVER HE KNOWS, OR EVEN THINKS, THAT CHRIST HAS BEEN."

The Rev. LESLIE D. WEATHERHEAD:
"THE MOST SINCERE TRIBUTE I CAN PAY TO YOUR SPLENDID NEW BOOK BY H. V. MORTON IS THAT HAVING GOT MY OWN COPY, AND HAVING READ IT, I IMMEDIATELY ORDERED FIVE MORE COPIES FOR MY FRIENDS . . . HEARTY CONGRATULATIONS ON A MAGNIFICENT ACHIEVEMENT."

THE METHODIST RECORDER:
"THE MOST FASCINATING TRAVEL BOOK ANY VISITOR TO PALESTINE HAS EVER WRITTEN, AND ONE OF THE MOST REVEALING COMMENTARIES ON HOLY WRIT."

Popular Edition. 24 Illustrations ... ... **7s. 6d.**
Extra-illustrated Edition ... ... **20s.**
Limited and signed Edition-de-Luxe, 101 copies ... ... **£5 5s.**

RICH & COWAN, 25 SOHO SQUARE, LONDON, W.1

The Positive Organ Co (1922) Ltd
Church Organ Builders

NEW ORGANS, REBUILDS, ENLARGEMENTS
RENOVATIONS, REVOICING, REPAIRS AND
TUNINGS, ETC. . . . . ELECTRIC BLOWING

PNEUMATIC & ELECTRIC ACTIONS

Registered Office and Works:
PAMBER STREET, WALMER ROAD
N. KENSINGTON, LONDON, W.10

Estimates and Specifications on Application

SOLE BUILDERS OF THE POSITIVE ORGAN FOR SMALL CHURCHES

OUR CONTRIBUTORS.

Pacific School of Religion Berkeley, Calif.

Rev. E. Griffith-Jones, B.A., D.D. Ex-Principal of Yorkshire United College, Bradford. Ex-Chairman of the Congregational Union of England and Wales.

Rev. F. C. Grant, D.D., Th.D. Dean of Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, Illinois, U.S.A. Editor of the *Anglican Theological Review*.

Rev. W. D. Davies, M.A., B.D. Sometime Professor of Philosophy of Religion at the United Theological College, Abersystwyth.

Mr. Orlando A. Mansfield, Mus.Doc., F.R.C.O. Organist and Composer.

Rev. H. A. Popley, B.A. L.M.S. Missionary, Erode, South India.

Rev. J. Wright Buckham, D.D. Professor of Christian Philosophy and Philosophy of Religion in the Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Cal.

Rev. E. B. Chaffee. Superintendent of the Labour Temple, New York City. Author of *The Protestant Churches and the Industrial Crisis*.

Rev. G. E. Phillips, M.A. Foreign Secretary, L.M.S.

Rev. E. Sherman Oakley, M.A. (Deceased). L.M.S. Missionary in India, 1888-1928.

Rev. E. G. Homrighausen, S.T.M., Th.D. Minister of the Reformed Church, Indianapolis. Professor-Lecturer in Butler University. A translator of Barth's *Come Holy Spirit*.

Mr. William Band, M.Sc. Professor of Physics, Yenchin University, Peiping, China.

A Banker in Lancashire.

Rev. J. Emrys Morgan, B.A., B.D. Congregational Minister, Darwen.

Rev. A. Graham Eldridge. Congregational Minister, Morley.

Sir John Adams, M.A., B.Sc., LL.D. (Deceased). Emeritus Professor of Education, University of London.

Mr. A. Boyce Gibson, M.A. Lecturer in Philosophy, Birmingham University.

The Hayes
SWANWICK
DERBY

SITUATED in the centre of England **12 Miles North of Derby.** . . . Well appointed Public Rooms. . . . Private Chapel on the Estate. **Over 200 Single Bedrooms** . . . . Every facility for indoor and outdoor Games. . . . Private Swimming Bath. . . There is an excellent Camp Site with permanent Kitchen and Sanitary accommodation.

and High Leigh Hoddesdon
HERTS

EXCELLENT Accommodation. . . Private Chapel. . . Good Catering. Pleasant Gardens. . . Hard Tennis Courts. . . **19 Miles North of London. . . Available for Conferences of not more than 160 people.**

These Conference Centres offer the maximum of comfort and efficiency at the minimum of cost. A visit will convince you.

First Conference Estate, Ltd. . . the Proprietors, have over twenty years experience of the requirements of Conferences of all types, and this experience has been put to practical advantage in the development of " The Hayes " and " High Leigh."

The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL.

THESE words will be read just before the Christmas Season, which will no doubt be marked, as usual, by a wave of sentiment and generosity. We cannot but feel that many good people are often worse rather than better for sentimental experiences, and even for Christmas. Too often they are moved by an account of hardship or suffering, they go home to supper, and they forget: they give their half-crowns or guineas, enjoying the process, and then conscience is stilled. Is not this the case to-day in regard to the permanent unemployed? Three years ago denominational Assemblies were passing resolutions, and denominational Committees recording experiments, all with the unemployed in mind—and one or two brave spirits even wanted to protest against the inadequacy of unemployment pay. Now people, even Christian people, seem to have fallen back into apathy and unconcern. The trade figures are slowly improving, companies are resuming or increasing dividends, something is to be done for the depressed areas, and, after all, the problem is too big for individual treatment—so men argue to themselves and cease to worry about the unemployed.

The other day a member of a suburban church described the impression made on his fellow-members when it was discovered that one of the congregation, who had been in fair circumstances, was falling ill because, unknown to most, he was unemployed and attempting to live on unemployment pay. There you have the problem in a nutshell. It requires personal experience to bring home the realities of a situation. Personal sympathy is a preliminary to social awareness, and many Christians are not sensitive to the plight of millions of men, women, and children in our own land because their eyes are closed to something which would prove profoundly unpleasant did they dwell on it.

Mr. J. B. Priestley has pointed out that while in the North and Midlands his *English Journey* had a wide sale, London passed it by. There are praiseworthy instances where southern towns have shown concern for derelict areas, but in the main their inhabitants are content to read the slowly improving employment figures, and to ignore the widespread hardship they still represent. Just as it would be a salutary experience for all adults to visit a hospital once every year that they might be reminded of the never-ceasing pain of humanity,

so there is need that they should have the lot of unemployed men and women constantly brought to their notice.

Why should all people with assured, even if small, incomes be ill at ease to-day? We cannot even outline the problem, but here are a few facts. The family income for an unemployed man with wife and two children is 27s. In many cases 10s. from this goes in rent, leaving 17s. for everything else—food, clothing, light, heat, cleaning materials, insurance. Recently a London hospital dietician has shown that 18s. is insufficient to feed a family of four, even if all the food were bought at the lowest prices and the mother a skilled housewife. This means gradual deterioration in health for the adults, and collapse, sooner or later, for the children. Through under nourishment men who have been unemployed for long periods are often physically incapable of doing a full day's work, and are increasingly morbid and irritable. In *Civilization and the Unemployed* (S.C.M., 3s. 6d.)—a book which we cordially commend to all who read these pages—Miss A. M. Cameron, who has done splendid work among the unemployed in Lincoln, tells of families where there was nothing to eat from Thursday breakfast until "the dole" was received on Friday, and of unemployed youths who, when brought to a London hostel, were found to have lived on bread and butter [? margarine] so long that it was difficult for them to adapt themselves to any other diet. And the deterioration is not only physical. The craftsman loses his skill, and most men lose heart and hope when, having sought for work in vain, they go out morning after morning not knowing where to go or what to do. To-day, trying hard does not get a man a job; and it is impossible to exaggerate the havoc prolonged unemployment plays with character and morale—and not least so among youths.

If, as seems likely, this country is doomed to a large margin of permanently unemployed, the Christian churches must discover some better way than has yet appeared of keeping their members informed and sensitive, and of translating sympathy into useful help.

* * *

At the same time the churches must show an increasing discontent with an economic system which produces this state of affairs. They need not become slaves of any economic system—of the Russian or American experiments any more than of the systems of Major Douglas or Mr. Upton Sinclair, but they must say—and say emphatically—that a system of unlimited private profits which can only be maintained at the cost of human life and character is alien to the mind of Christ. Some people are always terrified lest the churches should become socialistic. The greater danger, surely, is lest they should be unconcerned for the poor and the oppressed. And

with the mass of the working people outside the churches there is little danger of churches "going red." Indeed, part of the problem is that while the employer element is always largely represented in denominational high places—though less so than a generation ago—it is almost impossible to obtain direct representation of workingmen on denominational committees. This is in some degree due to the fact that committees meet during the day. If such representatives can be secured (and experience leads to doubts on that point) a way should be found to get the benefit of their co-operation. Representatives of the working classes are now on Borough and County Councils. It is worth thought and trouble to try to get them on, say, County Union Executives and Congregational Union Committees.

* * *

THESE remarks on the attitude of the Churches to social questions remind us that Congregationalism in the United States is having a lively time owing to the repercussions of the New Deal and the economic situation generally. The last National Council of the Congregational Churches, held at Oberlin, not merely set up a Council of Social Action, but passed resolutions which showed a definite departure from the individualism which has always characterized America—and especially American business. Many—churches as well as individuals—have protested against the implications of the resolution. We are endeavouring to secure from the States an authoritative account of the events leading to the National Council's action, and subsequent thereto.

* * *

THE direct and incisive preaching of Dr. W. B. Selbie is greatly missed in Oxford, and in Congregational churches throughout the land. It is with the more pleasure that we find him preaching through the written word, and *Faith and Life* (Hodder, 3s. 6d.) so reproduces the familiar accents that we can almost hear the words spoken. Dr. Selbie has never had much patience with the frills of religion; he puts first things first, and insists on those central things on which the well-being of the Church of Christ depends. We recommend Christian preachers to read for themselves these invigorating papers: they will find in them much that they wish to convey to their congregations. Not least do we hope they will listen to the counsel contained in these words:

> To revive historic Congregationalism will mean much more than denominational reform. It will be a return to the methods of primitive Christianity when little groups of spiritually awakened men and women met for the worship of God and mutual help and edification, and, working like a potent leaven in the world, turned it upside down. It mattered nothing that their numbers were small, or that their social

status was lowly, because they were charged with the power of God. The weapons of their warfare were not carnal—numbers, money, or prestige; but spiritual—faith, prayer and the contagion of a great experience. The force of their testimony to the outside world lay in the intensity of their experience and in the reality of those "fruits" which their lives revealed. In this respect history has repeated itself more than once, and the lesson for the Church of to-day is obvious.

To put the matter quite bluntly, the churches must abandon their belief in numbers, organization and material resources. There is no magic in numbers and no miracle in wealth. The only thing that counts in the Church is the Spirit of God in the hearts and lives of its members.

When this has been digested some of our mentors would do well to ponder words recently written by Dr. F. W. Boreham:

> The history of the English Puritans offers a striking illustration of the singular circumstance that orthodoxy often waxes as faith wanes. In the golden age of Puritanism no two Puritans thought exactly alike. It did not occur to any man to adjust his beliefs to the creed of other people. As a result it happened that a great body of ideas came to be held in common, whilst, on minor matters, those who held those ideas differed widely. There was no such thing as orthodoxy; but faith was general. Then came the tragedy. The spirit of Puritanism vanished: the body alone remained. The later Puritanism consisted, not in a beatific vision and glowing faith, but in an inflexible creed and an intolerant spirit. Each separate Puritan was required to believe as all other Puritans believed, and had to express his faith in the same phraseology and even in the same tone of voice. When orthodoxy came in at the door, faith flew out at the window.

* * *

These notes have frequently proclaimed, with perhaps too great a stridency, the need for simplicity of speech in the pulpit. The average preacher has no idea how unintelligible his terminology is to the man in the street, or even in the pew. Preachers, however, are scarcely the worst offenders. What is to be made of this?

> Taking for prototype the most clearly articulate, the most sonorously vocal, the Literary Intelligentsia, we see it split into mutually antagonistic schools or shoals, each shoal or school having an exhaustive critico-creative programme which it "plugs" by all possible means, and, however pitiable it may appear to an outsider, the guerilla warfare between the different schools is waged with the whole man and on issues which are truly believed by the combatants to be fundamental.

Or this, saying there is need for intellectual leadership?

> leadership—an ungrateful word perhaps but implying here nothing more and nothing less than the union in one man, or in a close-knit body of equals, firstly of proven integrity, secondly of a scheme of metaphysical belief free of purely temporary contingencies and capable of securing wide allegiance, though not necessarily to all the terms of its formulation, and thirdly of a dialectic applicable and resolutely applied to all the major problems confronting those who are conscious of themselves as factors, on the one hand, of a social structure, and, on the other, of a cultural tradition.

They are extracts from Mr. Rayner Heppenstall's *Middleton Murry: A Study in Excellent Normality* (Cape, 5s.) a book written expressly for those under 35, the very title of which is enough to damn it. The life of Jesus, by the way, is to Mr. Heppenstall

> an emergent value itself, the shoring in symbol of a descried next condition in human evolution,

and his general thesis

> *(Jesus+Shakespeare+Blake+Marx)×Murry=Good Modernity.*

Is there any wonder that when, on page 120, he begins a new chapter, he says, no doubt as bewildered as his readers:

> We must look round now and see where we are. ?

Mr. Middleton Murry, we believe, is a significant portent of our times. But nobody will be convinced of this by the quips and cleverness and modernity (*The Waste Land* is "the culminating achievement of the Christian Era") of Mr. Heppenstall. Mr. Heppenstall can never forget himself in his subject. If he had given the time to striving after being simple which he has given to trying to be smart we might have learnt something about Mr. Murry. Heaven help the young if this is all the moderns can do for them. Meanwhile preachers may learn from this particular modern how not to do it!

* * *

The truest and the most significant sentence in the four volumes of Mr. Lloyd George's *War Memoirs* so far published is that in which he remarks that no prophecy regarding the future of society is worthy of consideration if it fails to remember the exaltation of the war years and the heights to which men were then lifted. The Master of Balliol says something of the same kind in his Beckly Lecture when speaking of "the good which came out of the collective emotion which is characteristic of war." He goes on, however, to say:

> If our everyday membership of a Church were what it ought to be, it should produce an everyday willingness to sympathize with and understand one another, to give up our sectional interests for the common good, without our needing to be inspired by mass emotion. Italy and Russia and Germany are deliberately using war psychology to perform tasks of peace; but that is to cast out Satan by Satan. The inevitable results are obvious to us all. Union and common action are procured by the suppression of opposition and criticism. The critic is treated as an enemy. It is possible in such ways to get united action, but not to get wisdom. If we are to avoid such methods and yet meet our common difficulties, we shall have so to cultivate a sane and everyday understanding that we can differ and yet act together. Are we going to be able to refer proudly to the rich variety of our common life, or to have to talk of our unhappy divisions? On the answer to that question depends our power to preserve our democracy.

The R.T.S. is to be congratulated on an enterprising year. Not only has the publication of the Penny Biographies and the Lutterworth Papers been continued, but scholars have been profoundly grateful for the translation of Prof. Emil Brunner's *Der Mittler* and for Dr. Adolf Keller's books on the religious situation in Europe. At the same time the periodicals for boys and girls have been well maintained, and parents could not do better than use them this Christmas. The *Boys' Own* and *Girls' Own* are 12s. 6d., the *New Empire Annual* 7s. 6d., the *School Boys', School Girls',* and *Child's Companion* 3s. 6d., and *Little Dots'* 2s. 6d. We have to confess that on a Saturday morning we spent far too long with the *Boys' Own,* which contains some very good stories about well-known footballers and cricketers.

* * *

At the beginning of the twelfth year of this journal, we have to thank readers the world over for their continued support and appreciation. It is our endeavour to make the *Congregational Quarterly* of service not merely to the churches of the denomination with which it is connected, but to all those engaged in the fight for truth and righteousness. From time to time the journal has benefited greatly from suggestions made by its readers. We hope they will not hesitate to propound any ideas they have for increasing the usefulness of any section, or to make any criticism.

Once more we are increasing this issue by sixteen pages to cope with the output of books. The Index and Title Page for 1934 is enclosed with the issue.

* * *

Several features about this issue call for mention. In the first place, it is the melancholy fact that two of our contributors have died since sending their manuscripts—the Rev. E. S. Oakley, after a life-time of splendid service in India, and the veteran educationalist, Sir John Adams. Sir John, whose last years were spent in California, has put thousands of day and Sunday School teachers in his debt, and it is specially interesting to have his views on the children's address. Then this number may almost be called an American number, for it contains articles by four distinguished Americans, Dean F. C. Grant, the Editor of the *Anglican Theological Review,* Prof. J. Wright Buckham, of the Pacific School of Religion, Pastor E. G. Homrighausen, a translator of Barth's *Come, Holy Spirit,* and the Rev. E. B. Chaffee, Superintendent of the Labour Temple, New York City. We can learn a great deal from the United States in a good many ways, and the more the two English-speaking peoples share their views and engage in co-operative thinking, the better it will be for the world.

Three articles deal with Christian Missions. They are written from very different points of view, and even the two from the pens of those who have intimate knowledge of church life in India suggest what remarkable diversity of opinion is possible. The Rev. Godfrey Phillips has always been a strong supporter of the Scheme for Church Union in South India, and we trust that readers of this journal will respond to his appeal for careful study of the situation. At present there are those at home, and on the Field—and not least in North India—whose views of the Scheme are very different from those of Mr. Phillips. The right policy for Christians in this country should surely be to allow the Indian Churches to work out their own salvation, while securing that they are allowed to do so; there is some ground for fear lest powerful personalities and organizations should impose their opinions on the Indian Churches now, and endeavour to ensure that those views will prevail thirty years hence.

* * *

If Mr. Percy Allen had devoted to the question of disarmament and security the same energy as he has shown in investigating the Shakespeare question, even these difficult problems would have been solved ere now. He is a champion of the theory that the author of the majority of the plays attributed to Shakespeare was Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford. This theory is based entirely on internal evidence. Most of the plays are brought forward some twenty years and topical allusions found in them. In emphasizing the topicality of the plays, Mr. Allen has done good service, but by the methods he uses it is possible to prove anything in heaven and earth. His new book *Anne Cecil, Elizabeth and Oxford* (Archer, 10s. 6d.) takes the Oxford theory a step farther. Edward de Vere, the Earl of Oxford, married Anne Cecil, Burghley's daughter. He was also, so Mr. Allen tells us, the lover of the Queen, who had a son by him in the year 1574. This son was the "Fair Youth" of the Sonnets, who was opposed to his father in the rivalry which raged between the Oxfordians on the one side and the Chapmanites on the other. From the plays and the sonnets and the writings of Spenser, as well as Oxford's own poems, Mr. Allen draws the data for his theory. This sentence will illustrate his method:

> Why should false painting imitate his cheek,
> And steal dead seeing of his living *hue ?*
> Why should poor *beauty* indirectly seek
> *Roses* of *shadow,* since his *rose* is true?

wherein "hue," or Hughes, is the son; "Beauty" is Queen Elizabeth; "Rose" is the Tudor Rose; "shadow"—a word often used of actors, is again the actor-son; while "his rose is true" means, simply, that he is the true son, or Vere son, of the Tudor Rose, Elizabeth.

Again when Spenser mentions *Will,* Mr. Allen tells us that *Will* is simply another name for "well," or "spring," or "Vere"—"well" being often spelt, in ancient days, "will," or "wyll."

There is not, of course, the slightest external evidence of the birth of a son to the Queen. Does Mr. Allen really think that a reigning monarch in the sixteenth century could conceal pregnancy and the birth of a child? Whenever he discusses matters historical he is unconvincing: where, *e.g.*, does he find ground for saying that Grindal "was in deep disgrace with Burghley and his party"?

Anybody can play Mr. Allen's pretty game and produce any desired result. Let us try it.

Here is a book: *Anne Cecil, Elizabeth and Oxford.* By Percy Allen. From the first three words in this title we derive the letters A-L-L-E-N; from the whole title we also get P-A-X-T-O-N and C-O-N, this denoting that one Paxton is a Congregationalist. From the title, too, we get the letters A-L-B-E-R-T P-E-E-L, and also the letters B A L [T] I C. This would suggest that Percy Allen, Paxton, a Congregationalist, and Albert Peel, were sometime together in the Bal[t]ic. Does this mean the Baltic Ocean? No, for the omission of the letter "t" in Baltic at once suggests "tea," which immediately suggests Boston Harbour. These three persons, therefore, were together on the *Baltic* sailing from the United States. The title gives the letter A, which signifies number 1; there are 9 letters in Elizabeth; there are 2 n's in *Anne*; and *Oxford* gives us O. The date of this voyage, therefore, was 1-9-2-0. The three persons mentioned actually were on the *Baltic* sailing from the United States in 1920, and therefore Edward de Vere wrote Shakespeare's plays, and had a child by Elizabeth.

* * *

THE best story we have met this quarter comes from the Esher *Journals*. The entry (14th January, 1910) speaks for itself:

> Sir G. Clarke wrote to Morley that he had been reading a "very interesting and instructive book, which he *supposed* was familiar to J.M."—Carlyle's *French Revolution*. Imagine J.M.'s face!

* * *

THE attention of the Legal Committee of the Congregational Union and other members of the legal profession is called to the following:

St. Peter, finding that the boundary wall of his domain was beginning to crack owing to the excessive heat arising from adjacent property, wrote to Satan pointing out his responsibility and requesting compensation. Satan replied:

> My Dear St. Peter,
>
> I have taken legal advice on your letter of yesterday's date and am informed that I am not liable.
>
> With much regard,
>
> Yours faithfully,

St. Peter, no legal advice being obtainable, was obliged to acquiesce.

DUFF AND "UNITED."

I GLADLY accept this opportunity of paying a tribute to the memory of a colleague and friend. And yet my pen hesitates and halts—not for lack of material, but because the material is so unmanageable and illusive. It is easy to write about some men, whether they be great or ordinary, because their characteristic qualities are obvious, objective, and easily describable. Here is a man who, with all his great and obvious qualities, and a personality of outstanding prominence, was yet a mystery to himself and to those who knew him best; and to ignore this mystery in an attempt to be pragmatic would be to miss that which made him what he fundamentally was.

The salient facts of his life may be told in a few sentences. Alexander Duff, to become M.A., D.D., LL.D., was born in Scotland in 1845, and brought up in a Canadian Manse by parents of much force of character and deep piety. He was educated at McGill University, Montreal; at Andover Seminary, in the States; and in various German Universities, where he came under the influence of Ritschl and Wellhausen, absorbing the evangelical fervour (and, I may add, the cloudy philosophical background) of the former, and adopting the higher critical views of the latter in their acutest form. In the fullness of time, he was selected as one of his colleagues by A. M. Fairbairn when in 1877 he became the Principal of Airedale College, Bradford, as it was known before it came "the United" on its amalgamation with Rotherham College in 1887-8. There he worked as Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Literature till his retirement nine years ago, after forty-seven years' service. He spent the years of his retirement in a picturesque cottage at Bare, Morecambe, cared for tenderly by his gifted and devoted wife; but he regularly attended the meetings of the College Governors almost to the end in September at the ripe age of 89.

A bare statement of facts! How little does it do justice to that vivid, fiery, tumultuous, but most lovable personality. Duff of "United" left a profound impression on a long succession of students who imbibed from him a new and living conception of the *Old Testament*, not as a plane surface of verbally inspired oracles and histories, but as the authentic record of God's dealings with His ancient people in preparation for the coming of His Living Word in Jesus of Nazareth. He was so radical in his critical handling of the materials of the *O.T.* that the first result of his impact on his junior class each session was sometimes almost a complete collapse of their early faith; but for those who opened their minds more fully, instead of closing them up in a panic, the ancient documents soon

became the living, breathing Book of God's self-revelation in redemptive love. Let it be freely recognized that Dr. Duff could not teach Hebrew as a language to anyone, and sad and frequent was the friction between him and his pupils on the failure of most of them to master the grammatical forms and syntax of that mysterious but, to those who can penetrate through the crabbed shell to the inner kernel, fascinating tongue. Indeed, we may say he never had an easy time in his handling of linguistics, in spite of his own brilliant mastery of that complex of Hebrew, Syriac, Aramaic, and other elements that make up the language of the *O.T.* But who was there in the last, or in this, generation who so caught the living spirit of ancient prophecy, or expounded with more passionate and fruitful eloquence than he the message of those rugged preachers, and its application to the social and religious needs of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries? And here again, to avoid misunderstanding I must enter a *caveat*—I am not referring to his series of books on the Hebrew prophets; for sound as they are in substance, their style is difficult and abrupt, and there be few who have read them through. I am thinking rather of the prophetic soul in the classroom, who made the Bible a new and living book to the preachers of to-day, as he did in a marked degree to such outstanding men as J. H. Jowett, Matthew Stanley, Francis Wrigley, Bertram Smith, and many scores of excellent preachers now scattered throughout the world.

Nor must we forget that it is to Duff as well as to Robertson Smith and the galaxy of Scotch professors and to Peake that we owe that courageous battle for the historical instead of the "fundamentalist" Bible which it was the achievement of the last half century of Biblical scholarship to establish. It is easy going now; but in Duff's youth and early manhood it was a mark of noble courage to venture into the lists for an honest Bible. These men laboured, and we have entered into their labours; many of them inherited not the promises —"that they without us should not be made perfect."

My last word must be brief, but intimate. To those who knew him well and knew him at his best, there was revealed a soul of rare and beautiful piety, and that of a peculiarly attractive kind. There were times when one stood almost aghast at the things he would do and say, for there was an incalculable and irresponsible element in him which was never tamed or brought into subjection. But the heart of him was the heart of a little child, and those whom he did love he loved with an intensity that was pathetic. There were times when he and I had to differ, and differ profoundly, but so clear and true was his spirit at the core that I can say without qualification of all our differences and tensions that the worst of them was but an incident in an ever growing and sweetening friendship.

E. Griffith-Jones.

WHY THE CHURCH?

It requires no great gift of imagination to see in our time one of the days of judgment that are for ever overtaking human history. The *crisis*, that is, the "judgment," is upon us. All of our inherited institutions are under fire: democratic government, trial by jury, monogamy, the family and the home, popular education, capitalism, unearned income, interest and rent, the "sacred" rights of property, the obligation of debtors, freedom of speech and of the press—every one of these has its attackers and defenders at the present day. Not one of them but appears, to some critics, like the fig tree in the Parable:

> Behold, these three years I come seeking fruit on this fig tree, and find none: cut it down; why cumbereth it the ground?

It is no wonder if, in a time of strain and tension and of acute disillusionment like the present, the institutions of religion should likewise be put to the test. For the religious institutions of our race are among the oldest and most deeply rooted in human society. The old, insistent questions will not be downed: why should we support—or endure—any longer a highly expensive organized religion which seems, at least, to grow ever more and more out of touch with the real needs of society? Upon any theory of genuine social solidarity, should not the Church be required to render an account of its stewardship, and show just cause for its continued maintenance by society—if not by direct contributions, at least by exemption from taxes, where such special privilege is enjoyed, or by income from endowments, or by specific establishment as the State Church, as in England, Scotland, Sweden, Germany, and (under modification) in Maryland and Virginia? Must not the Church, like every other organization or institution in society, prove its social value, and demonstrate clearly that it renders a *quid pro quo*, a full return in service for value received in cash, in special discounts and exemptions, or in the way of favours and privileges of whatever sort?

In a way, this is nothing new, but only a continuation of a movement initiated in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, set in full swing by the Renaissance and Reformation, and ploughing steadily ahead through the history of Europe and America during the succeeding period and down to the present. At the height of the Middle Ages the Catholic Church not only claimed to be in control of Western society, and to determine the destinies of nations and individuals in Christendom; it actually enjoyed a large measure of such control. But ever since the days of the Renaissance in Italy and of the

Reformation in Germany and Northern Europe the revolt has been on, and Catholicism has steadily been

> Retreating, to the breath
> Of the night wind, down the vast edges drear
> And naked shingles of the world.

Far from the Protestant revolt being fully accomplished in the sixteenth century, its latest phases are even now being reported in the news dispatches of our daily papers. Moreover, such are the strange, kaleidoscopic transformations effected in social history that the movement which began as a religious revolt has turned out now to be something quite different. Though the early Reformers rejected a considerable part of the Catholic tradition, their difference from the Roman Church was mainly negative. They were in truth, as contrasted with modern Protestants, all but indistinguishable from Catholics in their general religious outlook. But there can be no doubt that in upsetting the equilibrium of the "medieval synthesis" they released (some may prefer to say, they responded to) vast forces that, gaining momentum, have moved ever since in the direction of a political and philosophical secularism, nationalism, and an ethical naturalism. What began as a revolt against certain extravagances and abuses of the medieval Roman Church has effectively aided and encouraged a revolt against all religious authority, tradition, and institutionalism. Even the Roman Church itself, despite its natural revulsion in the direction of ultra-conservatism, has not remained unaffected by its experience during the past four centuries; it is in many respects, both outwardly and inwardly, a different Church from the Catholic Church of Western Europe before the Reformation. And in the Protestant world, the continuous "dissidence of dissent" and "separation for opinion's sake," as Matthew Arnold called it, has led to the effective disunity and paralysis of the Church when faced with the acute problems of modern industrialism, nationalism, and secularizing education. Strong efforts are now under way to restore the broken unity of the Christian Church; and it is high time, if the Church is to utter articulately and coherently whatever message it has to bring to the modern world on the questions that most vitally concern the welfare and even the destiny of our society, or the happiness and wholeness (or "salvation") of individual men and women and children in this generation.

It is not in the least strange, then, if critics of organized religion have much to complain of in the Church of these days. Professor Baker Brownell, for example, in his recent *Earth is Enough,* insists that the outward symbols of a religious faith have never before been more completely divorced from the underlying needs of men, and even from the satisfactions religion seeks to provide. Like many others, he turns away from organized religion to seek in mysticism, in his case a naturalistic mysticism, the satisfactions he personally

requires. But this, alas, means cutting adrift from the great religious inheritance of our own past, and it is not difficult to sense a degree of pathos in his charming book—which a friendly reviewer has caricatured as, "Earth Is All I Have Left!" It is surely a sign of the times: here is one of our fellows, whom it is no exaggeration to describe as *anima naturaliter religiosa*, sensing the burden of Protestant religious institutionalism, openly avowing himself among the hungry sheep who look up and are not fed, and yet determined to capture, somehow, for himself and his readers and students, that point-instant of real and absolute living which is the heart of religion, and if possible make it permanent. One thinks of St. Augustine, with his strong strain of Neo-Platonist mysticism, and his "moment of intelligence;" and one is sure that, given a different background and experience, our author would have been a devout Catholic! Shift him back on one of Einstein's bending rays and set him in the midst of the thirteenth century, and it would be extremely interesting to guess in which of the many French or Flemish or English cloisters his rare spirit would feel most at home! For critics of religious institutionalism were not uncommon in those days, even among groups who apparently depended most upon its sheltering protection.

But this is the twentieth century, not the thirteenth, and times have changed. Russia has rejected the Orthodox Church; in Germany, the Nazis are in quest of a blonde, Aryan, purely Teutonic deity, perhaps Wotan, to take the place of Christ; in Spain, now, as in France and in Mexico, the Catholic Church is defeated and dispossessed; in Italy, Catholicism, outwardly safe enough, must watch its political step more carefully than ever; while in Britain and America the religious struggle is, so far at least, only slightly less political and a little more intellectual and academic, but equally momentous on the economic level and in the arena of social thinking generally. The insistent question that ever rises before us, and refuses to be hushed, is plainly, Why the Church? As a voluntary society of individuals, like an art or music club, the Church would be innocuous enough, though even so it might not escape the attacks of satire and ridicule; but no Church is content to be a voluntary society and nothing more. No religious society was ever more avowedly "voluntary" than Congregationalism in New England; but does anyone suppose the Puritan theocracy was content to let dissenters think, talk, or act as they chose, without some kind of reckoning with the secular arm? By its very nature and constitution, a Church must undertake the welfare of surrounding society, however variously that welfare may be conceived—whether as missions to the heathen, or as social service to the poor and needy, or as the education of the ignorant and underprivileged, or as the erection and maintenance of hospitals for the sick, or as propaganda for national temperance, or as the proclamation of justice in industry and

commerce, or as red-hot evangelism and "revival" preaching to the sin-hardened and impenitent in the neighbourhood. As a religious organization, therefore, a Church is *ipso facto* concerned with something beyond the salvation in another world of the souls of its own members. Hence all the trouble, and the complaints against religious interference in politics and business; to some among our contemporaries it even seems that, speaking generally, the more uncertain the Church becomes of the precise contents and limits of its own inner experience, and of the significance of its own religious faith, the more vigorously the organized religious groups redouble their efforts to "save" society from hell—or from intemperance, or divorce, or economic oppression, or salacious moving pictures, or whatever happens to appeal to the current opinion of reformers as demanding most attention and for the moment most needing reformation. This helps to explain the bitterness of feeling one sometimes senses in the question, Why the Church? Men resent the effort to "compel them to come in" from the highways and hedges of this broad and burly, turbulent, and sinful, earth; especially when the citadel of Zion appears to be anything but a peaceful and secure retreat, resounds with violent controversy from time to time, and seems to the worldly-wise a sanctuary already somewhat overcrowded with people whose chief concern in life is to regulate the affairs of their neighbours.

But it is extremely unlikely that the world, or even that part of it we call Western Civilization, will settle down in this impasse. Man is essentially a religious animal; he really does live by "admiration, hope and love;" he forsakes his half gods, but only to seek new and adequately adorable deities; he re-fashions his religious and political institutions, but only in order to shape them somewhat "nearer to the heart's desire;" as incurably religious, he is never at rest until in some measure of degree his heart, as Augustine said, is at rest in God. And if the traditional religious institutions of our race prove inadequate, they will nevertheless not be discarded, but will be revamped and revised until they somewhat more adequately meet human needs. Even Bolshevistic Communism, extreme as it is, has discarded Orthodoxy only to set up itself as a kind of substitute-religion for the Russian people. And as for controversy, no religion of mankind has ever been in healthier state than when faced with opposition and set as "a sign to be spoken against," and compelled to give a reason for the faith that is in it, against all comers. It reminds one of Dr. Crile's observation on the health of the army:

> Man is a fighting animal, and is never in better health than when at war.

It might be well to inquire then what are the religious needs of men which the Church either fails or succeeds in satisfying. Such inquiry is the practical motive, no doubt, behind all the vast output of works on apologetics and philosophy of religion which burden

our shelves these days: what is the real inner meaning and what is the permanent significance of this human experience we call religion? Psychologists have attempted the answer, historians of religion, sociologists, philosophers, essayists, moralists, and even poets. After two generations and more of such sustained effort, are we any nearer an answer to our question? There can be little doubt that abundant materials are now on hand, and if we are ever to find the answer, it should be soon. The proper approach is certainly through our own religion—there are such manifold subtle nuances and shadings in religious meaning, in every faith, that one does well to understand fully his own inherited religion, and to be content with only a general and quite objective outline of other systems. It is unlikely, moreover, that we in this generation shall make much progress in interpreting the meaning of religion except along the historical line of approach; most of us in these days are not naturally mystics or philosophers; nor are there many saints amongst us or religious geniuses, whose religion is a purely immediate and first-hand possession; whereas we have been schooled in historical study, from kindergarten up. Further, we had better begin with Christianity; for although we may have some first-hand acquaintance with other faiths—*e.g.*, Bahaism, or Mohammedanism—which are naturally to be found in many of our cosmopolitan centres in this widely-travelled world, they are all newcomers, and exotic, and have as yet scarcely begun to gear into our social situation or be widely influential. As for Judaism, the orthodox variety is almost equally exotic, and likewise far too nationalistic—a transplanted Near-Eastern religion still unacclimatized to the modern world; while the reformed variety steadily tends to approximate more and more closely to Liberal Christianity of a minor pattern.

* * *

Taken as a whole, and viewed historically, Christian thought—theological, devotional, and practical—has formed a huge ellipsoid with three foci, like some of the cruder symbols of its own Blessed Trinity. The three phases of this vast tripolar system are easily identifiable, in a rough general way, with the three successive stages in Christian history up to the present time. These three foci or poles are to be found deeply embedded in the Christian doctrines of Eschatology, the Incarnation, and the Atonement.

I. Though coming last in most treatises on Christian doctrine, Eschatology or "the doctrine of the Last Things" (*viz.*, Death, Judgment, Heaven, and Hell) really came first, historically. It is another case where "the first shall be last;" by its very subject-matter, the doctrine came naturally to form the closing chapter in any systematic treatment of dogmatic theology. On the other hand, everyone knows that Christianity began its career as a Messianic

faith. The earliest Christians centred their hopes upon the "appearing" (or re-appearing, we should say) of Jesus as Messiah, riding on the clouds of heaven, coming to hold the Last Judgment and rescue His redeemed not only from the throes of death, but also from the outrages and oppressions of "this present evil world." The idea was variously conceived, depending mainly upon the amount and quality of inherited theology taken over with it from the apocalyptic school of Judaism, or introduced into the Church (in Hellenistic circles) from the conceptions of the other world and of future destiny popular in the Græco-Roman world. In its cruder forms it inspired such beliefs as those of Chiliasm or Millenarianism —the thousand-years' reign of Christ and His Saints upon a restored and regenerate earth—a belief that persisted widely until well after the time of Origen, and still survives among certain sects to this day. In its more spiritual or transcendent forms, it inspired the vision of the heavenly city, coming down from God, adorned as a bride, to take the place of the present "æon of lawlessness." In every one of the various forms it took, the idea was essentially utopian, proclaimed a glorious future when sin and death should be no more, and held up an exalted view of God's purposes for man; and always it was a utopia to be wrought by divine intervention, not by human effort. Its ultimate goal was a condition of mundane affairs in which "the kingdoms of this world are become the Kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ," when the prayer of the ancient Psalmist should be answered, and God "take His great power and reign" over a redeemed earth. It is obvious that this stage of Christian history, and this form of expression of the Christian gospel, were both Palestinian Jewish, and reflected the circumstances of the origin of our faith. Large sections of the New Testament are wholly under the influence of the "eschatological" outlook—not only the Synoptic Gospels and the Apocalypse of John, but even the Epistles of St. Paul. Only less obvious, but equally true, is it that this utopian dream derived from apocalyptic Judaism was essentially, as it was in origin, a political-economic idea: the inevitable form taken by political and economic idealism among a strongly religious and God-conscious people like the ancient Jews. Hence it is not difficult to discover its generic relationship with modern social idealism, even of the non-religious kind; and also with ecclesiastical idealism, much later in date. There have been paradoxes enough in history; but none is more striking than the use made by the Papacy—certainly the greatest *practical* effort the Christian Church has made to claim the kingdoms of the world for Christ—of the saying attributed to Him in the most eschatological of the Gospels, *Matthew*: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church." And yet, underlying both Jewish Christian utopianism and medieval ecclesiastical idealism was a common social motive: God is concerned with human history,

and has a genuine will and purpose for human society. In that magnificent conception, the individual (exalted by later Protestantism) took a very subordinate place. Who knows?—perhaps we are coming to look upon human history and human society from a similar vantage-point, and to conceive that there may be after all a will of God our Maker to reckon with. Karl Barth is not the only one who thinks this; he only exaggerates what the Christian Church, speaking generally of both Catholicism and Protestantism, has always maintained since its earliest days.

II. When the Church burst the bonds of Christian Judaism and launched out into the wide Mediterranean world with its heritage of Greek philosophy and its newly-imported Græco-Oriental religious cults, it was not long in adapting itself to the needs of those whose outlook was in some respects diametrically opposed to Palestinian Judaism. "The Greeks seek after wisdom." From Plato onward, and from before Plato, from the Orphics and Pythagoras, the pattern of Greek religious thought was the quest for knowledge, *gnosis,* the knowledge of God and things divine. Even immortality was viewed as the consequence of possessing such knowledge rather than as the effect of a supernatural restoration or resurrection, as it was among the Jews. This idea the mystery religions reinforced and amplified, along the lines of the spiritual realism of Greek philosophy. For them, *gnosis* was cognate with a participation in the divine nature—whether as cause or effect was not always clearly stated: the soul either became divine through the gift of heavenly knowledge; or the heavenly knowledge resulted from human partaking in the divine nature. Viewed either way, the heart of the idea was a mystical union with the divine, mediated either through sacraments or through a sacred secret lore, shared only by the initiate.

We can see the great transition in process, from primitive Christian Messianism to the mystical, quasi-gnostic, Hellenized Oriental philosophy of religion, in the *New Testament* writing known to us as the *Gospel of John.* Jesus is no longer the Prophet of Nazareth, or even the Jewish Messiah, but the Logos or Word or Son of God, with God from all eternity, and "tabernacling" among men for the purpose of saving mankind, imparting to them a divine Wisdom, and enabling them to share in His own divine nature through partaking of His Body and Blood. Out of this conception grew in time the full Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation, expressed most clearly and simply by St. Athanasius: "God became man in order that man might become divine"; and expressed most elaborately in the Formula and Decrees of the Council of Chalcedon in A.D. 451. Incarnation was quite as natural a concept of the relation of God and man, for Greek thought, at least in the Patristic age, as it was unthinkable for Palestinian Judaism, with its Messiah coming on

the clouds. It summed up all the long toil of centuries of thought in the Greek world on the problems of religion: as Paul Elmer More maintains, there is a straight line running from Socrates and Plato to the Council of Chalcedon; and, as Dean Inge has put it, Catholic Christianity is quite as truly the heir of Greek philosophy as it is of Hebraism and Judaism. There ought really to be a Third Testament in the Catholic Bible, in addition to the Hebrew Old and the Christian New; and it should contain the works of Plato and Cleanthes, Virgil and Epictetus—or at least their noblest passages. One cannot begin to understand the Greek element in Christian theology apart from the great philosophical tradition that flowed like a river into Christian theology in the days of Justin Martyr and the Apologists—and even earlier— and deposited its golden sands along the banks from their time to that of Clement and Origen, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Basil and the Gregories.

III. But the needs of men were not exhausted with a delineation of the future history of the world, or the redemption and restoration of human nature through participation in the divine; a practical problem, present from the beginning, still persisted: What shall be done with man's past, with the sin "that so easily besets us," and the guilt that weighs down our souls?

Palestine and Greece had made their contribution; but the West was still to be heard from, the Latin West and the Germanic North; Italy, Spain, Gaul, Britain, Germany, the Scandinavian lands, and the Low Countries. It is equally indubitable that, still speaking in general terms, Latin thought never took real hold of the central Greek dogma, man's deification through God's Incarnation, any more than Greek thought really grasped the full meaning of Palestinian Jewish-Christian Messianism or Eschatology. Men always fashion their inherited ideas in accordance with their own predilections, outlooks, and interests. Not that any age lives in a water-tight compartment, and wholly ignores the received patterns of thought which its ancestors have cherished. But the emphasis was clearly different, in each succeeding age, as the Christian centre of gravity—and probably also of population—shifted slowly westward. And the interests of the Latin West and the Latinized North were simply "soteriological": what shall be done with sin? The answer was clearly one word, summing up the age-old experience of the race from before the dawn of history: Sacrifice. Of course this was the answer of Palestine and Greece as well; it was a perfectly natural category of religious thought in the Græco-Roman world, as well as in the Hebraic and Jewish. But never before in Christian history had such all but exclusive emphasis been placed upon it. The Sacrifice of the Cross, the Atonement, the Sacrifice of the Mass, participation in the merits of Christ's death through Baptism, Repentance, Communion,

and even the Viaticum: the whole centre of interest in Latin Christianity was clearly here, to a degree it had never been in Primitive or in Greek Christianity. (The fact is established, quite apart from literary evidence, by the history of Christian art. Paintings of the crucifixion, crucifixes, and "calvaries" were unknown in the East before the Ninth Century.) Whatever its origins—Robertson Smith's theory of sacrifice as communion may be true for certain very early levels—it certainly meant propitiatory, piacular suffering, a vicarious punishment and death, for long periods in Western Christian thought, for the older Protestantism equally as for medieval and modern Catholicism. Socially viewed, *i.e.*, from the point of view of the social history of ideas, it seems clear that this idea, born of an inherited and really very ancient religious outlook, answered to certain deep human needs; back of all the *theologies* of the Atonement lay an experience, struggling to get itself adequately articulated in coherent and logical language.

* * *

Now it is certainly a mistake to make the transition from Palestinian Christian Judaism to the Græco-Roman world and Hellenistic Christianity, or from that to the practically-orientated Latin West, too sharp and abrupt. Apocalyptism was not unknown in the Hellenistic world: witness Virgil's *Fourth Eclogue* and the sixth *Aeneid* and the *Sibylline Oracles*. Moreover, genuine anticipations of the doctrines of Atonement and Incarnation are to be found in Palestinian Christian Judaism, and perhaps even in the *Old Testament*; certainly in the oldest strata of the *New Testament*. But the successive emphases are really to be seen in the history of Christian thought; and the truth probably is that all three reflect permanent needs of the human spirit, which the Christian Church satisfies in varying measures. The rounded scheme of ideas preserved in the traditional theology represents the struggle of Western man for the past nineteen centuries to get his religious ideas clear, and to show that the mystical satisfaction of his deepest inner urges is genuinely consonant with sound reason and the best science and philosophy of his time. One wonders what would happen were we to dissolve that scheme, or to subtract even one major element from its balanced synthesis; would the remainder of the scheme go on functioning, after a fashion? Or would it collapse entirely? And may it not be better, as Professor Bevan urges, to go on using the old credal formulas, since a new formula, inevitably using modern terminology, would tie us down to interpretations implying so exact an agreement as to destroy that larger freedom of thought which is now possible without loss of unity?

But are these terms, Messiah, Incarnation, Atonement, still adequate as symbols of our religious experience, or adequate as

interpretations of the meaning of Jesus for our time? Scarcely—without amplification, or explanation. Still they are valuable, at least as the summing-up of the experience of the past. And who are we, to possess new wants and desires unheard of in all human history hitherto? Somehow, we feel, the truth lies in that direction; and the terms men have devised or adopted for the purpose of expressing what they believed to be the place of Jesus in the universe relatively to God and to mankind and to the world's total history, or to set forth the satisfactions of spiritual, moral, or intellectual need that the faith in Him has provided—these terms may not be wholly adequate, and may not even be very clear in meaning these days, without a historical explanation, but nevertheless they do go a long way toward registering the response of the human spirit to His surpassing influence. As Dr. A. E. J. Rawlinson writes[1],

> Every one of the terms in which men have tried to set forth the Person and work of Jesus—Messiah, Son of Man, Son of God, Sacrifice, Passover, Lamb of God, Logos—so far from making Jesus more intelligible to us than He is without them, needs interpretation to-day.

No doubt our religious terminology needs supplementing and enrichment, as we learn steadily to recognize more and more clearly in our own experience who Jesus is and what He stands for, and discover ever more fully the real needs of men that His life and teaching meet, and the manner in which He meets them. But do we do wisely to discard the old in order to make way for the new, before the new are determined upon, or even, perhaps, invented? Ours is an age of scientific discovery and mechanical invention; but it is at least not self-evidently one of great spiritual progress or of fresh exploration in the realm of religious or ethical truth.

And it may very well be that our deepest needs will turn out to be similar to those which the Christian scheme envisages and satisfies:

1. A solution of the enigma of history, of the time process, of the succession of events in the world, so contrary, apparently, to all man's fondest hopes.

2. A solution of the problem confronting man in his effort to rise above the impotence and mortality of his biological nature, and become "partaker of life and immortality."

3. A solution of the very practical problem of putting away the dead past, beginning anew, making a fresh start, and rising above one's own other self—the "old man dead in sins and trespasses." Even the psycho-analyst has to devise a technique for meeting this situation—by an objectification and repudiation of the past; and it would not be surprising if the technique of the Church, which completely objectifies sin and "hates the sin but loves the sinner," and teaches that even God Himself does no less, has something to impart

[1] *Foundations*, 160.

to our much too introspective and too self-analytical generation on this score.

I leave it to others to expound the advantages of an inherited religious system, intertwined with all our traditions of culture, art, music, literature, and common thought. My answer to the question, "Why the Church?", is that the Church's real business is religion, not social service or philanthropy or political reform—though the Church, if true to her best self, can no more help inspiring men to all good works than a good woman can help bringing out the best in her husband and children, or a genuine saint help inspiring his neighbours; and that the real business of the Church is to provide satisfactions, not of man's superficial and temporary wants, or problems, but of his deep and abiding needs—as Meredith wrote of nature, in *Earth and Man,*

> She . . . will soothe his need,
> Not his desire.

And these deepest and most perennial needs of man seem to underlie, like deep-shadowed pools, the flickering and changing and varicoloured theories of men in our own racial past, not least, but indeed most clearly obvious in the Church's thought about her own fundamental dogmas. The needs are clear; whether or not the satisfactions provided by the Christian Church are really adequate is still another question—to be answered probably by faith; or, if denied, then denied out of one's own experience of life and not by rational argument alone. But if organized religion does no more than call attention to the permanent spiritual needs of mankind in these hectic, troubled days, I for one feel its existence is justified, in large measure; and a real, if not entirely adequate, answer is given to our question, "Why the Church?"

At the same time an inescapable task confronts the Church, that of translating her strange, antique symbols into the language of modern thought. It can be done! For it has twice been done already—Christian thought moved out of the categories of Jewish Messianism and took on those of Græco-Oriental theosophy and mysticism; then it shifted out of this sphere and into that of the Latin mind, into a world of Canon Law and of legal, jurisprudential concepts—"merit," "satisfaction," "punishment," "damages," "propitiation," "persons;" and Christianity survived the transplanting. To-day we face the dawn of still another age in Christian history, with a new set of concepts and a new language for their expression, but the same old needs and urges within us. "Mankind is always advancing," said Goethe; "man remains ever the same." What that language will be, one can easily guess; it won't be apocalyptic Messianism or eschatology; it won't be Hellenistic philosophy, with its categories of "substance," "nature," "hypostasis,"

and its concept of deification; nor will it be Latin legalism; as inevitably as to-morrow's sunrise, it will be the language of modern science, especially of psychology, as a famous Archbishop of Canterbury predicted.

It is no use saying that it cannot be done. For the thing has been done, repeatedly. Moreover, it is noteworthy that each re-interpretation of Christianity in the past has ushered in a new age of expansion. It was so when the Gospel passed beyond the borders of Palestinian Judaism and entered upon its conquest of the Græco-Roman world; it was so when the Apologists translated the Faith into the language of the Greek Logos-philosophy; it was so when the early missionaries to the barbarians, fired with zeal by a fresh new insight into the meaning of life and a new understanding of the relations of God and man, went forth conquering and to conquer in the name of their Heavenly King—not the Incarnate Logos of the Greek Fathers or the Athanasian Christ, but the *Rex Gloriæ Christus* of Medieval and especially Western devotion. What the world and the Church await to-day—the world somewhat more impatiently than the Church—is a fresh, new, vivid, inspiring expression of the everlasting Gospel in the language of our own day.

In the meantime, I, an individual, have my life to live and my part to take in that human society upon which I am dependent for my welfare, happiness, and very existence. What must I do—not only "to be saved," but to share in the great spiritual adventure of the race? For one thing, surely it is my duty to help to hand on "the best we know", and have received from the past, to coming generations. For another, surely it is my duty to remain within the fellowship of the religious society to which I now belong, as loyally as I can, and bring up my children within it. For still another, surely it is my duty to get on beyond the merely critical attitude of the observer, get off the side-lines and into the game, stand up and be counted when the time comes. An attitude of indifference or of unconcern, an interest in religion in general and in the abstract, with no vital loyalty to the Church in the concrete and particular, is an attitude unworthy of any man who thinks himself intelligent, knows anything about his own racial past, feels any sympathy for the spiritual and intellectual struggles of by-gone generations, shares any kind of enthusiastic response to the vast moral adventure of humanity, feels any responsibility for the highest welfare of his fellows, or claims to be a citizen of the great world lying beyond his own domestic doorstep.

Frederick C. Grant.

WHITTIER FACE TO FACE.

Ah, did you see Shelley plain,
And did he stop and speak to you,
And did you speak to him again?
How strange it seems and new!

It was naturally not my good fortune to see Shelley plain and speak with him, nor yet Browning; but I did have the good fortune to see and speak with a poet in some respects hardly less rare and incomparable—John Greenleaf Whittier. Such an experience makes an event in one's life.

Our meeting came about in this wise. The White Mountains of New Hampshire have been translated by Whittier into the spiritual realm and touched with a light that never was on land or sea, somewhat as the Lake Country of England has been "sublimated" (or should I say *sublimed*?) by Wordsworth and the Sierra Nevada by John Muir. It was among these New Hampshire hills and woods and streams that Whittier spent the summers of the later years of his life. A number of his poems reflect this comradeship, such as "Mountain Pictures," "By the Lakeside," "Sunset on the Bear-camp," "Sweet Fern," and "Storm on Lake Asquam."

In the summer of 1889 Mr. Whittier came with his cousins, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Cartland, of Newburyport, to Conway, where I, having just graduated from Andover Seminary, was Home Missionary pastor of the Congregational Church. Mr. Whittier and his friends domiciled at the Conway House in the village. The coming of so notable a guest naturally caused a pleasant stir in the town, and his presence lent a new and finer atmosphere to the life of the community. In due course of time my wife and sister and I went to call upon him. We were kindly received by a reserved and courtly gentleman whose personality, while it was not in the slightest degree severe or self-contained, produced a strong feeling of veneration. He was tall and erect with white hair—he was then eighty-two years of age—and his face was full of a rare and beautiful composure, goodness, and refinement.

The most striking thing about him was his eyes, which were a dark lucent brown, almost black—a family heritage from his mother—and reminded one of a New England woodland, as if the shadowed haunts of fern and flowers by mountain brooks had stolen into them and made their home in the depths of his nature.

Throughout the call we remained spellbound in admiring awe, listening to his harmonious and kindly voice as he endeavoured to make us feel at ease, much as if we were children listening to a revered teacher. Learning that I had just graduated from Andover Seminary, which was then under nation-wide criticism for its

departure from orthodoxy, Mr. Whittier expressed his interest in the Seminary and its Faculty and his pleasure in the progress of the more humane and Christian type of theology which it represented.

The one definite saying of his that I bore away from the conversation and which I have cherished ever since, with an increasing sense of its significance, was in connexion with a call Charles Kingsley had paid him. During their conversation Kingsley said to Whittier that having lived in his earlier years in the atmosphere of a very harsh and repellent notion of the Divine Being, in keeping with the theology of the time, no words could describe his relief when he came to the conclusion that *God is at least as good as the average church member*!

Mr. Whittier did not attend worship in Conway, there being no Quaker meeting in the vicinity, but he showed his regard for the little church by coming to the midsummer sale conducted by the ladies of the church and making a purchase or two to help on its work. His interest in Conway is indicated in the following extracts from letters published in Samuel T. Pickard's *The Life and Letters of John Greenleaf Whittier*[1].

Conway, N. H., 7th mo., 24, 1889.

. . . We have just returned from the banks of the Saco, where it is joined by the Swift River—a very fine bit for a painter.[2]

11th mo., 7, 1889.

. . . Last summer, in Conway, I found a town without a poor-house, because there was nobody that needed it. There were no rich men, but the village was a model of neatness, every house freshly painted and comfortable. The young clergyman had a salary of $400 a year[3], and I was told that the cost of living was less than $300 per family. There was no liquor allowed in the place. The small savings bank had a deposit of $80,000. With economy, sobriety, and the absence of ostentation, display, and extravagance, the example of Conway might be imitated in our country towns, and to some extent in our cities.

The allusion which Mr. Whittier made to the change to a less harsh and repugnant idea of God, and one more in keeping with the spirit and teaching of Jesus—a change which came in during the latter half of the nineteenth century—recalls the very large part which he himself had in bringing it about, a service which has hardly been sufficiently recognized. It is comparable to what Burns, in a somewhat different manner, did in exposing and dispossessing the rigours of Calvinism in Scotland, with such poems as "Holy Willie's Prayer," "Address to the Unco Guid," and others.

Poetry—especially when it is known and loved by the common people—like David's "smooth stone" from the sling slays the

[1] II. 739, 742.

[2] A beautiful picture, in water colours, of the confluence of the two rivers, painted by one of the guests, was presented to him by people in the village.

[3] Mr. Whittier was misinformed as to my salary, which was $700 ($300 being contributed by the New Hampshire Home Missionary Society).

Goliaths of a blustering dogmatic theology more effectively than the cumbrous invectives of sermon or theological treatise. Whittier's "Eternal Goodness" and "Our Master," copied in the family paper, or his "The Minister's Daughter", recited in the schoolroom by some tender maiden on exhibition day, accomplished inestimable good in melting away the dismal drifts of New England Calvinism that lingered even to the close of the last century.

The extent to which this unchristian doctrinism pervaded the thoughts of the time is revealed in the fact, disclosed in his poem "The Eternal Goodness," that even Whittier's fellow Quakers, whose central doctrine was that of the Inner Light, and who might be supposed to be free from the narrowness and intolerance of the more orthodox creed-holding bodies, nevertheless shared in some degree the ideas and spirit of a severe and loveless Calvinism. It is these Quaker "Friends" whom he addresses with such affectionate and regretful yet unsparing words in "The Eternal Goodness."

O Friends! with whom my feet have trod
The quiet aisles of prayer,
Glad witness to your zeal for God
And love of man I bear.

I trace your lines of argument;
Your logic linked and strong
I weigh as one who dreads dissent,
And fears a doubt as wrong.

But still my human hands are weak
To hold your iron creeds:
Against the words ye bid me speak
My heart within me pleads.

. . . . . .

Not mine to look where cherubim
And seraphs may not see,
But nothing can be good in Him
Which evil is in me.

The wrong that pains my soul below
I dare not throne above,
I know not of His hate,—I know
His goodness and His love.

"Nothing can be good in Him which evil is in me"—this is theology as sound as it is simple. If this principle had only been given its rightful place in theology, what misleading paths might have been avoided!

The next time I looked into the face of Whittier was at the Christmas-tide following his summer sojourn in Conway, when, opening a package in the mail, I saw his benign face looking out from a photograph, on the back of which was written, in his own hand, "John W. Buckham from thy Friend John G. Whittier." This thoughtful remembrance made him in a sense our household guest. What was our consternation, therefore, when in the fire that consumed

our home in 1921 this cherished gift, along with others, disappeared. Yet there are things that fire cannot burn, although it usually makes short shrift with photographs. Several days after the fire I was poking about amidst the ashes of half-consumed books and letters and manuscripts and theological lectures (which perhaps it was well that I had to rewrite) when suddenly my foot turned up a half-burned photograph. I took it up in haste and there, framed in a sort of charred halo, stood out in undisturbed serenity the face of the beloved poet, undimmed by fire and smoke! I felt as if an invisible spark of cheer and goodwill had again passed from his spirit to mine.

There has been a striking remergence of Whittier into the spiritual life of our time as a hymn-writer—a part which he himself never dreamed of playing. "A good hymn," he once said,

> is the best use to which poetry can be devoted and I do not claim that I have succeeded in composing one[1].

Such hymns as he did write for that express purpose, like that composed for the dedication of Starr King's church in San Francisco, have never come into general use; yet, singularly enough, by means of verses never intended as hymns, he has taken his place as a hymn-writer beside the immortal and indispensable Watts and the equally immortal Charles Wesley, both of whom deliberately and perseveringly set themselves the task of hymn-writing.

This happy adaptation of selections from Whittier's poems to serve as hymns is to be credited to certain discerning compilers of hymn-books who saw the hymnal qualities of these verses and set them to hymn-tunes. These sagacious editors are deserving of gratitude only less than that due to Whittier himself.

An outstanding instance of a poem otherwise of no especial merit —except that it so strikingly contrasts abnormal religion with normal —moving into a hymn of rare beauty and devotion is Whittier's "The Brewing of Soma." Toward its close the poem flows, like a rapid stream that has suddenly reached a meadow, into the beautiful and quieting verses which form the familiar hymn beginning:

> Dear Lord and Father of mankind, Forgive our fev'rish ways.

Why is it that Whittier's hymns have become such universal favourites? It is—is it not?—because they are so warmly human yet so reverent, so mystical yet so sane, so deep in thought and feeling yet so simple in form.

The two main themes of his best-known hymns lie close to the heart of Christianity. The first is Christ "the Heavenly Vine,"

> Most human and yet most divine, The flower of man and God.

The other is:

> Immortal Love, forever full, Forever flowing free,
> Forever shared, forever whole, A never-ebbing sea.

JOHN WRIGHT BUCKHAM.

[1] Jeremiah Bascom Reeves, *The Hymn as Literature*, 305.

THE PANOPLY OF PAUL.

I. One of the supreme penalties of greatness is misrepresentation. Among the sons of Wisdom there hath not risen a greater than Paul, the preacher of the Cross of Christ among the Gentiles, and the father of the creeds of the Church. None, either, of humanity's teachers has suffered more misrepresentation at the hands of friends and foes alike. Indeed, one wonders whether his friends' lack of true insight has not wrought his teaching more real harm than the bitterness of his critics.

Despite the definite and reiterated emphasis of competent expositors that the Pauline Epistles are indeed epistles, just as truly as the letters of Cicero or Pliny, we still relapse, almost unconsciously, into the uncomfortable sense of awe felt in the presence of some calmly infallible authority who occasionally sits down, like a Regius Professor, to set forth his considered and final pronouncements. In these "Epistles" we have the last word, the authoritative formulation, of the truth of the Christian faith, and only a hardened intellectual impertinence added to spiritual perversity can ask "Are we really bound to accept what St. Paul says in the Epistle to the . . . as the last word?"

The ingenuity of theological disputants has discovered a by-pass marked "Exposition." For the honest, if somewhat irreverent, question, another and more euphonious query has been substituted: "In what sense precisely are we to interpret the word of St. Paul in . . . ?" In all forms of literature, from the Homeric poems to Shakespearian drama, exposition and interpretation open out a wonderful hunting-ground to men of ingenious minds and lively imaginations. With these aids, men of far-divergent views have found in identical works of Plato and Aristotle, in the very same words of Christ or Paul, the perfect and unmistakable expression of their own ideas. Was it, perhaps, decreed that Euripides should write plays so that Gilbert Murray might suggest brilliant textual emendations? Paul, at least, never imagined that he was providing in his living letters of doctrinal direction and practical advice a playing-field for the instinct of ingenious interpretation unequalled in the whole range of religious and secular literature. Exegesis, which should connote the orderly pageant which an exhibitor leads out of camp or castle, has all too often in the case of Paul meant straggling prejudices of all sorts which have assembled from the by-ways of thought, and attached themselves in motley array to his banner.

Until recently—and, indeed, still, among the stewards of the dogmatic literalism to which the name Fundamentalism is arrogated—

the rod of divine inspiration was used freely to break the obduracy of any objector to the particular exposition favoured by this or that doctrinal party. The word heretic, which normally indicated the very general and natural trait of "sticking to" one's point of view, acquired an ugly significance of wicked arrogance, if not also demoniac possession. The ultimate threat of anathema, giving up the victim of intellectual *hubris* to the devil and all the powers of darkness, is not even yet so entirely strange history of the bad old times as we like to imagine in our more optimistic moments. In many sections of the so-called Free Churches as well as in that Church which avowedly abides by a final Revealed Truth, it is still a sin against the Holy Ghost to admire Paul without worshipping him.

II. The infallible Pauline theology sooner or later breaks down in every form for one very simple reason—that Paul was not infallible, and that he himself never dreamt of preferring such a claim as his self-styled disciples have put forward in his name. He never set himself to compose theological essays; much less did he aim at a complete and infallible system of doctrine which should embody the meaning of truth "as it is in Jesus" in terms of thought and according to the laws of logic. He had neither the time, nor, one may safely infer from what we know of his vivid personality, the desire to theologize in the systematic and scholarly sense. He was essentially a man with an active, urgent mission, to go forth among the Gentiles and preach the Cross as a tremendous fact and immediate dynamic in the experience of men who "believed only." That certainly did not mean that he would wish to make Christianity a sheer emotional experience, or divorce its "life" from truth as the intellectual aspect of reality, but it does remind us that he did not himself regard his oral or written doctrine as primarily or deliberately a theological system. A fire had been sent from above into his bones which prevailed against any inclination, derived from his scholastic training, to analyse cleverly and calmly the content of his experience, which indeed in part he definitely describes as unspeakable. Expository ingenuity must constantly remind itself that in Paul it is interpreting one who thought of "the riches of the grace" which had been vouchsafed to him as only in a very minor degree treasures of discursive reason. "The things of the spirit which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man", constitute that divine "mystery" which is now indeed an open secret, but revealed by the Spirit of God to the deep spirit of man, not to the wisdom of this world. Even this "spiritual" experience is here and now only partial as it is embodied in knowledge and prophetic inspiration; the vision of reality is, even as a "spiritual" whole, but a blurred reflection of the full insight "face to face" on a higher plane of experience hereafter.

Ephesians and *Philippians* amply prove that his final and mature estimate of the Christian experience demanded a type of "spiritual" gnosis—almost a religio-æsthetic "appreciation"—fundamentally unlike, if not also opposed to any purely human gnosis dealing with reality according to "the wisdom of men." The sceptical empiricism which is the main-spring of that wisdom stands at the other extreme from Paul's faith-conditioned gnosis. Through faith are we saved intellectually, for any philosophy which can claim to give a true account of reality must draw upon the inner illumination of the spirit which is "the gift of God." Paul is himself an empiricist, but the experience upon which his philosophy is built is neither sceptical nor tentative, but full assurance of life. Herein lies the key to the specific character of his philosophy—for cosmology it is beyond a doubt, especially in the last group of letters, not theology in the departmental academic sense. It is a *wide* philosophy, co-extensive with life, the life of man and the life of God revealed in Christ; it is also a certain, *confident* philosophy, for it is grounded in experience, an assured conviction which is "persuaded that nothing present or to come shall be able to separate" the experient from the love of God.

False philosophies and the real Lady Philosophy are very alike to look at, as Lucian makes Truth to remark in his *Piscator;* "but you will quickly recognize her when she speaks." So, much theologizing which claims to be "of Paul" has contrived to imitate the garb and gait of his thought, but it is betrayed by its speech; it lacks the catholic and confident note of the Pauline cosmology, for which "all things in heaven and on earth and under the earth" are subject to the Christ-principle. The marks of "the excellency of the knowledge of Christ" are "the wideness of God's mercy," and the experience that "one door is open" ever to the chief of sinners and rebels.

Paul stands alone as the incomparably greatest thinker of the Christian Church on account of the broad, massive outline which he sketched, like a master-artist who draws quick, decisive lines for others to fill in. The success of those who come after will depend on the measure of their participation in the wide vision and masterly certainty of execution which the master brought to the task originally. Otherwise the filling-in process will not harmonize with his intention. In few cases have the Pauline disciples in any age brought to their work of fulfilment either the vision or the clear definition. For concentration on some one aspect is not vision, nor is prejudice certainty.

It is this breadth—and breadth in his case is not synonymous with laxity—and his quick, concise certainty in outlining the philosophical and practical implications of the truth of Christ, which set him in a class apart from such thinkers as Athanasius or Augustine, Aquinas or Calvin. They did what he had neither the time nor the interest to attempt; he achieved what they could not have done. He outlined

on a cosmic canvas the mystery of the Christ. Theological systems have, inevitably, lost sight of the tremendous scope of the broad lines; concentration on the trees has shut out the vast form of the forest.

III. To appreciate his philosophy at all, we must study his doctrine in relation to three things: (1) the character and personal experience of the author as a man and a Christian; (2) the material, the *paradosis* or tradition, upon which he worked; (3) the intellectual tendencies and the religious needs of the age in which Christianity began to crystallize into a philosophy, a "way" of thinking and of living.

Of these three fundamental considerations the first alone will concern us now; nor can we hope, with regard to this, to do more than outline four aspects of prime importance.

To estimate Paul's doctrine aright we must constantly bear in mind, firstly, his natural philosophic genius; secondly, his strict legalistic education; thirdly, his strong moral character; and fourthly, his extraordinary experience.

IV. Apart from any religious inspiration or spiritual illumination of his faculties, Paul was naturally a philosophic genius, a thinker of the first rank. He must be placed in the small Honours class of the world's truly great intellectuals, with Plato, the author of *Job*, and Kant. Interest in, and insistence on, his spiritual pre-eminence and his significance for religion, have tended to obscure this simple truth. He is one of history's really great brains, and would have lived as one of the giants of human evolution, even if divine revelation had not broken into his life to make him the greatest human figure in the world's greatest religion. It is no mechanical or "special" divine inspiration which places the letters of Paul in a class by themselves as a source of Christian cosmology. It is nothing mechanical of man or of God—and surely the essential absurdity of any such view of inspiration is that it associates the idea of the mechanical with God of all persons; it is one of the simple, divine things *supra naturam humanam* in the ordinary, dead-level sense, which from time to time illumine the pages of history and elevate human values. It is genius; nor must we qualify the statement and call it genius of the highest order. For there is but one of this, as of all such simple, divine things. Nor can we find more than half-a-dozen who by divine right take their place without debate or popular election in this company. Plato, Paul, Shakespeare, Kant . . . let us add the Buddha and Beethoven; then debate will arise, and we realize that we have descended from the level of the immortals to the good and better, the great and greater, where tastes or prejudices may vote.

His intellectual genius won recognition in his own restless and versatile age; it has proved the rightness of that recognition by its lasting and growing influence on the religious thought of succeeding ages. That influence remains to-day as unmistakable as ever. Despite our many differences of approach to religion and its "truth" to-day, our scientific criticism, our genetic analysis, our psychological evaluation, Pauline doctrine remains an element in Christian theology, a moment in the history of human thought generally, which no honest student can or would care to ignore. It is, after all, only the theological specialist who seriously excavates the thought of Augustine and Aquinas, of Cyril and Calvin, of Leo and Luther; every claimant for the title of theologian or philosopher of religion must be familiar with the Pauline outline of Christianity.

"There would have been no Christianity without Paul," remarks a character of Stephen McKenna. The statement is explained, not cancelled, by David O'Rane's reply, "There would have been no Paul without Christ." There would have been a Saul of Tarsus whom we should know to-day, but not the Paul that we do know. Something of abiding value he would have contributed to the treasury of human knowledge even had there never appeared "Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest." What Paul, "the new man created by the Will of God," who yet used "every power" of the natural man Saul, has contributed no Christian thinker of any age or any "school" has sought to scrap and clear away, to start building anew from a sounder foundation. Every great reformer, in thought and practice, has built on Paul, and proved again and again that "my Gospel" was indeed "the power of God, and the wisdom of God." Not the least intellectually significant, nor, as recent events in Germany have nobly proved, the least practically powerful movement in Christian thought to-day, has made the Pauline doctrine of faith the foundation of its whole structure.

Even the theology which criticizes his teaching, and claims attention mostly because of its criticism rather than its constructiveness, would not essay a completely new outline of Christian truth to supersede Paulinism. "He touched no type of literature which he did not adorn" is Johnson's somewhat insincere epitaph to Goldsmith. With how much more truth can we say of Paul that in his varied letters he touched no aspect of the truth of Christianity which he did not adorn with the beauty of abiding value?

He made mistakes. He thought, at one time of his life, that the end of the world and the second coming of Christ were at hand. He was great enough to admit his error, and to correct it. And in fact, when we come to consider carefully what errors are his, and which really are misrepresentations of his doctrine on the part of his expositors, we only marvel that he erred so little and so trivially. It

is mechanical minds such as Calvin's which have striven to turn the wonder of life and the will of the Eternal into mathematical problems for the cross-word mentality.

He has the infinite capacity for hard work and painful drudgery which has rightly been defined as a mark of genius; he possessed the natural and genuine intellectual genius itself. Of him supremely and uniquely in the long chronicle of Christian thought can we say—"by nature a philosopher . . . "

V. "As touching the law, a Pharisee." This is the second consideration to be borne in mind to appreciate his teaching. His outstanding native talent had been developed and informed in the rigid school of Jewish law. Pharisaism was religion in terms of legalism. To us a Pharisee is practically synonymous with a hypocrite, and doubtless many of the first-century Pharisees were hypocrites in the sense of pretending to be what they were not, nor, perhaps, even strove or desired to be. According to the law of averages, the more numerous the rules, religious or otherwise, the more hopeless it becomes to carry them out and keep the law. At the same time, the society which adopts them cannot admit this without bringing itself to ridicule and the law into discredit.

This is the dilemma of legalism in every age. It sets up an ideal which may be good as a matter of theory in morals or ceremonial, but, being law, it cannot make allowances for man's inevitable weaknesses. "In many things we all offend" are words of a somewhat legally-minded New Testament writer, but of one who had definitely turned from the power of legalism to the vision of "the end of the Lord, that the Lord is very pitiful, and of tender mercy." Law can tolerate no such confession of human frailty; it moves in a world of ideal functions and fulfilments. The practical result is inevitable. The frailties are concealed under the cloak of hypocrisy, a hypocrisy which must be tolerated since the punishment of the individual offender involves revelation of the weakness of the law itself. "The law could not" realize the object of religion, the salvation of human life to peace, joy, and completeness of personality, "in that it was," and always is, "weak through the flesh," in that it sets up an ideal which flesh and blood cannot attain and be perfectly honest.

The next step—again inevitable—is the preservation at all costs of the law's dignity and the respect due to the impossible ideal of its letter. Jesus's criticism of Pharisaism was just this, that they honoured this abstraction at the expense of the real claims of God and man. One may concede that it was not of malice aforethought that the Pharisees neglected the spirit of religion set forth in Hebrew prophecy—righteousness, holiness, humility, mercy; it was their preoccupation with the legal ideal which absorbed their time and,

ultimately, their interest. Moreover, men "cannot serve God and Mammon" though they may truly desire it, and often convince themselves that they succeed; religion cannot crystallize into legal minutiæ without sacrifice of its spiritual power.

Paul's legal training brought him face to face with this fundamental problem of religion. His natural philosophic insight realized the stubborn dilemma wound about its roots. His honesty of soul rejected a facile passing by on the other side. He felt deeply, even despairingly, in his own spirit the hopeless issue of legal righteousness, the sheer inadequacy of religious rules, even with the authority of divine law, to bring freedom and peace into human experience. Law did not stretch out a hand to draw the sinner up from the slough of despond; it pushed him back, pressed him deeper and ever deeper into the mire of hopeless good-intentions. A definite choice must be made. On the one side stood the Pharisaic ideal of legal righteousness, an end humanly unattainable, and even were it attainable, still barren of the true religious values—peace, joy, life. On the other side the Christian fact in experience was spiritual grace, something again unattainable as a matter of personal moral effort, but not impossible of realization because it is "given freely" and unconditionally by God in Christ.

Indirectly, it was his legalistic training, and the spiritual despair which it induced in his crystal-clear mind, which made the grace of God operating through faith the heart of the Pauline doctrine and the abiding truth of the Christian gospel. It is essentially a gospel of good tidings because it is the "gift of God;" its spontaneity effects what the law could never achieve, the fruits of this Spirit of Christ in experience forming naturally into peace and joy in a "holy spirit" and a "pure heart," a true life, complete, "eternal," in the boundless love of God the Father and God the Son, "even our Lord Jesus Christ."

Paul realized the dilemma and the imperative need to choose definitely between the law and grace, in virtue of his clear, candid mind and his own very real experience of legalism in action. The history of Christianity is largely the story of the Church's failure to preserve his wide vision, owing to sectarian prejudices and relapses into dogmatic and moralistic legalism. This return to Judaism and the circumcision-complex in some form or other will continue until the spiritual sense of the Church can accept heartily and unreservedly the Pauline view of the grace of God as "sufficient" for the individual and for society. In theological theory and religious practice alike the age-long attempt to find a compromise between law and grace is doomed to inevitable failure. Modern philosophical theology stands at the cross-roads. A frank acceptance of this truth of Pauline insight holds out a hope of something constructive and really "Christian"

in the Church's doctrinal and social utterances to-day and to-morrow. Another relapse into the traditional compromise will spell disaster for the Church as a live force in human problems. Already the Socialist movement outside the organized forms of Christianity has seized upon this vital, uncompromising truth as the key to the solution of social and international problems. Once again the dynamical Christian truth may have to pass outside the legalistic machine to perform acts of power in human history.

It was the strict pietism of his home, school, and church life, says Clement Webb, which made Kant a rebel against organized religion and a scoffer at the self-centred *schwärmerei* which grounded the reality of God in shallow emotionalism. The experience of Paul provides an interesting parallel, which his expositors have generally not appreciated; it was the strict, self-centred legalism of his home, school, and church which drove him to discover "salvation" in the grace of God in Christ, and "in none other." Thus the Cross as the supreme symbol of that love of God became the centre of his gospel and his doctrine. When theorists of the Atonement ignore completely the old legalistic concepts of payments, ransoms, *quid pro quo's* of all kinds, they will be in a position to make sense of Paul's doctrine of the Cross and Salvation. As it is, they start with a fundamental error which no amount of patient ingenuity can twist into the right answer.

Paul was the greatest gambler in the history of religion. He risked everything on the grace of God. He stood to lose or to gain all. "If indeed Christ was not raised from the dead" to prove the eternal triumph of love in the things of God and of men, then "of all men are we the most wretched." His claim to apostolic authority is the reality of his experience of "the Christ who liveth in me." On that experience he is prepared to risk everything; in all suffering and under the ridicule of the wisdom of this world, he is assured that the truth of life is in Christ, and that this knowledge of head and heart, of will and spirit, is sufficient for him and for all men.

The alternative to the gamble of grace is foredoomed to failure. Legalistic accountacy, the eternal *quid pro quo* balancing of good and evil, can lead only to despair. On its mechanical treadmill the sinner grows more and more hardened and sullen. Rebellion and enmity smoulder like banked fires in his soul till at last they burst forth with the fury of hope thwarted and mocked, in arraignment of God the mathematician and His law of endless righteous ordinances. Surely this gamble is not only a magnanimous gesture, but wise policy as well; "it is a Prince's part to pardon," and the wide mercy of God is vindicated as wisdom, for His gracious love has made one Pharisee an apostle, one persecutor a preacher, one enemy a bond-servant.

Religion

VI. Further, Pauline doctrine must be studied as the utterance of a man of outstanding moral character. This means, not only that Paul was, as a matter of fact, a good man, a man of sound moral principle, but that, in addition, he had great moral strength and clear conviction of values. Abstract philosophy undoubtedly tends to make the practical aspect of life and truth secondary and somewhat shadowy; it builds ideal castles in the air often at the expense of weakening, if only through inadvertent neglect, the foundations of ordinary living on earth. Very often the philosopher is driven by popular antagonism to become in practice a rebel; at the best he is suspect as the preacher of a strange doctrine. Socrates, Spinoza, Kant in different ways illustrate the gulf fixed between the world of philosophic ideals and the "hard facts" of daily life with its "irritating concerns and duties." On the one hand, dead-level society is naturally suspicious of the philosopher's independence and, as it often seems, superciliousness. On the other side, the suspected disciple of truth, in self-defence, as it were, grows critical of popular prejudices, and ultimately, unless he be endowed with much grace, anti-social, and a "hater of the rabble without the shrine" of Wisdom.

Unfortunately, our knowledge of Paul's great fight with popular prejudice over the place of circumcision in the Christian community is full of gaps and largely inferential. We do know certainly that he was bitterly criticized, and subjected to that acrimonious and unfair decrial which flourishes most in religious disputes. Probably the various charges to which he refers in his letters, charges remotely relevant or totally irrelevant to the original dispute, were largely inspired by Jewish legalism and suspicion. The caricature of his selfless energy as self-seeking presumption, of his fatherly care as despotic self-aggrandisement, of his apostolic zeal as a bastard arrogance, of his definite preaching as reckless perversion of the true gospel—this and, probably, much besides, was the acid test of the Christian philosopher's moral character. His greatness of soul, as well as of intellect, was manifested in the patient devotion to the main issue and the rancourless spirit of service which were his reply to his critics and detractors. A man of lesser character, albeit great ability, would have been drawn into acrimonious debate and futile defence, would have condescended to join in the party-feud, and Christianity as a world-religion would have disappeared, still-born, in the first century. His moral stature saved his intellectual genius from such bitterness and warping as permeated the outlook of Kant. In the absorbing passion of his Christ-service he strode through the slings and arrows of his opponents like a giant through the ambush of pygmies.

To the church at Corinth, where, it would seem, petty factiousness

had opened the door to criticism and suspicion of his motives, he expressed his lofty moral criterion briefly but conclusively—"With me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you" adversely; "yea, I judge not mine own self" charitably; "He that judgeth me is the Lord," in His complete knowledge not only of act and motive, but of spirit and character.

He was a man of mark, of supreme spiritual distinction, of soul-nobility and worth. Through his teaching there runs a high call, not only to cultivate suitable and necessary moral values, but even more to grow in spiritual character, what we may term Christ-worthiness. He warns against sins of the flesh as a practical teacher who refused to allow lofty thoughts to take his feet off the ground; he urges social virtues such as forgiveness, hospitality, patience; but these are but steps to the spiritual fulfilment of character in faith and love. The last group of letters strikingly illustrates this poise of his spiritual ideal and his moral enthusiasm. The second portion of *Ephesians* and of *Colossians* must be read, not as an appendix or an unrelated catalogue of practical virtues, but in the light of the spiritual end of Christian character expressed in the first section—"till we all come into the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ."

For Plato good and evil in this world were but shadowy forms of the Ideas eternal in the heavens, and with all his lofty imagery he bequeathed to idealism a fundamental dualism which persists to this day. For Paul the moral implications of grace are supreme realities in human character; for the grace of God is a spiritual and eternal dynamic here and now, growing, building up the believer to the measure of Christ, in Whom the eternal values of heaven and the concrete forms of human goodness are identified. For Paul, as for Christ, "life" and "eternal" are not antithetical but identical. "Life" is the eternal Christ value and divine *dunamis* in human experience and character. It moves as a cosmic principle on the farthest bounds of creation; it lives in the harmony of husband and wife, the trust of parent and child, the brotherhood of master and servant.

The genius of the philosopher was controlled by the moral and spiritual greatness of the man in whom Christ dwelt, having found a temple by nature meet for His Spirit. The "man in Christ" who "was caught up into Paradise, and heard unspeakable words," felt at times, in the manifold tribulations of the flesh, the pull of that beatific vision of "years ago;" his moral greatness kept him at his post, guarding the interests of the King, serving His subjects, building the city of God. He "kept the faith," not a triumph of doctrinal

consistency, but an achievement of spiritual loyalty and Great-heart service for the King.

VII. The last regulative consideration noted—Paul's revolutionary experience of Christ—although, in a sense, the most impressive of all, need not occupy us at length for our present purpose. It is not our business to explain it, but merely to relate it to his teaching. Thus considered it is very simple. It was the catastrophic event in time which turned his intellectual genius to Christ, to find in His life and death and teaching the truth of God; which also subdued the zeal and force of his great personality to the service of Christ utterly and for ever. Paul was "turned" from darkness to light, so that doubt or debate about the validity of his experience was sheerly inconceivable. His doctrine grew, or should one say sprang, out of that conversion, and holds enshrined within itself the freshness of his own catastrophe. It is "Theology of Crisis" *par excellence,* which imposes on any exposition or interpretation a peculiarly stringent condition of success. That condition is community in the definite faith-experience, fellowship in the freshness of the new life.

Does this mean that we must standardize the faith-experience? Will Paul remain a closed book except to those fortunate few whose spiritual life has known catastrophe and passed through crisis? He lived in the first century, when the glamour of dawn glorified the "way;" before centuries of dogma and debate fashioned it into a dusty high-road of orthodoxy. For many Christians to-day catastrophe, crisis, conversion, are names like fairy, giant, dragon; they connote realities of another age of romance and miracle, or realities to-day in the privileged universe of poet and seer. They do not deny their reality; indeed, they envy the elect who are led into that universe of spiritual wonder and ineffable realities. Still they are puzzled. Is the faith-experience always and necessarily a definite crisis?

Would Paul, the greatest mystic and the greatest philosopher of Christianity, join in the questionnaire—When were you saved? Where? Through whom?

The answer we would offer, in view of his own teaching, is an emphatic negative. He, of all Christian teachers, has emphasized the catholicity of faith and the manifold riches of the grace of God. The essence of faith is assurance, but assurance in thought and in experience comes by various avenues. The ways of the Eternal are infinite and varied. From stones can God raise children unto Abraham. Blessed, indeed, are they who have seen God cross the path of their life like lightning, and have heard a voice from heaven calling them to certainty of hope. Yet, we reflect "in a cool hour," cannot He

> Who painted Autumn manifold,
> But no two leaves the same rich gold

show His glory in the steady light of the sun as truly as in the lightning-flash, and call in the "still small voice" as clearly as in the roll of the thunder?

Paul least of all, one feels certain, would wish to set up one type of experience as a rigid norm, or one reaction as the only condition of salvation. Doubtless he had heard the word of the Lord, "The spirit bloweth where it listeth, but thou knowest not its path." There run through all his letters the catholic phrases of his wide faith and broad sympathy: "ye also," like an echo of the "other sheep;" "diversities of gifts . . . differences of ministries according to the Grace given to us . . . according to the riches of His Grace;" and the far-flung benediction, like the mantle of God, which he casts over "all" who, amid differences of flesh and intellect, "love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity" of eternal spirit.

Only "let a man examine himself" and find within his own spirit the mark of God's hand as the seal of his salvation. The "stigma" of Christ remained indelible on the spirit and thought of Paul as truly as upon his frail flesh. To interpret his theology we must continually return to the Damascus road and watch again the fiery persecutor struck to the ground, the fearless eyes blinded by the great light of the Lord, the leader of Pharisaic legalism led by the hand to become the bondservant of the grace of Christ. Justification by faith, and the underlying thought of divine election, are then no airy theories but the only possible explanation of the supreme reality of his own life. As salvation was consummated outside Jerusalem, so the doctrine of salvation had its source outside Damascus, when Christ met Saul to "create the new man according to the will of God." And the form of that hour was stamped upon his doctrine like the image of a king on a coin of gold.

W. D. Davies.

EXPRESSION IN ENGLISH PSALMODY.

From the time of its origin, in the far-off days of the English Reformation, psalmody has rightly been regarded as peculiarly the people's part in what Mr. J. Spencer Curwen would have called our "worship music." Unfortunately, even in the most progressive periods of musical history, only a comparatively small portion of the general public has ever enjoyed the advantages of a liberal musical education. In addition to this, expression in musical performance, at least as it is understood to-day, is a development, or an evolution, rather than the completed creation of a moment. Hence the rendering of psalmody, at any rate in periods now past, must have been a more or less inexpressive affair. Refinement or elegance could not have constituted its chief characteristic. Consequently we may reasonably expect to find that any expression perceptible in its performance could only have appeared at a comparatively recent period of its history. These facts it will be the province of this paper to demonstrate.

In the Psalters of the Elizabethan age—the first and, in some respects, the finest specimens of English psalmody of the severer type—we need not expect to encounter such modern devices as expression marks. Until the 18th century these were almost unknown. Bach confined them to echo effects; Handel contented himself with such simple directions as are now denoted by the abbreviations *f* or *p*. Nor did the majority of the words to which the tunes of the 16th and 17th century psalters were set invite or even demand an expressive treatment. They consisted entirely of metrical paraphrases of the Psalms by Sternhold and Hopkins and some others, and were more remarkable for their ruggedness and austerity than for polish and refinement. The same applies in a lesser degree to the "new" version of Tate and Brady, which appeared in 1696. Indeed, it was not until the introduction of the more artistic paraphrases of Watts, and the establishment of modern hymnology through the productions of Watts, Doddridge, Wesley, and subsequent writers, that expression became a recognized constituent of psalmody proper. Henry Lawes (1595-1662)—the

> Harry, whose tuneful and well-measured song

forms the theme of Milton's celebrated Sonnet—in his Psalter of 1637, "set to new Tunes for private devotion, with a thorow Base for Voice or Instrument," the first psalter with original melodies, barred sections, new metres, and attempted "verbal illustrations" or "word painting"—gave no directions whatever as to any expression in the rendering. That there was no small need of such indications is to be inferred from old Thomas Mace's *Musick's Monument* of 1676.

This historical work on lute-playing, psalmody, and cathedral music, described by its author (b. 1620) as

> A Remembrancer of the best Practical Musick, both Divine and Civil, that has ever been known to have been in the world,

characterizes the psalmody of most of the country churches as

> whining, toting, yelling, or screeking . . . . as if the people were affrighted or distracted.

Towards the removal of these appalling defects no practical steps —at least as regards expression—were taken for nearly a century. The first movement in this direction came, in all probability, from Johann Friedrich Lampe, sometime a bassoonist in Handel's band, who came to England from Saxony, married Isabella Young, the sister of Mrs. Arne, and died in Edinburgh. About 1745 Lampe came under the influence of the Wesleys, having been previously a Deist; his friendship with Charles Wesley inspired the latter to the writing of a hymn upon the musician's death,—

> 'Tis done! the Sovereign Will's obeyed!

Lampe's attachment to Wesley was the direct cause of the Saxon musician setting to music, in 1746, under the title of *Hymns on the Great Festivals and Other Occasions,* some score or so of the Wesley hymns. These tunes were written in what Sir John Stainer once described as the "debased floriated" style of that period; consequently only a very few of them have survived, although Methodist collections of a later period, *e.g., Hawkes' Psalmody* (1832), contain several of the more substantial type, also a few are included in the so-called *"English" Hymnal.* Mr. J. T. Lightwood, in *Hymn Tunes and their Story,* was probably the first to direct attention to the fact that in the setting of Wesley's lines

> Sinful soul, what hast thou done?
> Murdered God's eternal Son,

Lampe directed the first line to be sung *piano* and the second *forte.* Although, as Mr. Lightwood remarks, this process is "not quite in accordance with our ideas on the subject," it seems almost more than probable that we have here the first recorded attempt at psalmodic expression.

In his *Sacred Melody,* the musical portion of John Wesley's *Select Hymns with Tunes Annext,* which appeared in 1761, some copies contained "interesting directions for singing." In these, amongst other instructions, the budding Methodists were advised to "sing modestly," and not to "bawl, so as to be heard above or distinct from the rest of the congregation." This, if not a direct instruction to sing with expression, came within measurable distance of such an order. Outside of Methodist circles it does not seem that any attempt whatever had been made in the direction of psalmodic

expression. Thus the Rev. W. D. Tattersall, in *Improved Psalmody* (1794), a series of settings of the paraphrases of the Psalms by the Rev. J. Merrick (1720-1769) and a work to which Haydn was invited to contribute, declared that in most of the Episcopal churches in London,

> the clerk and the charity children are almost the only performers, and . . . . there seems to be no management in the regulation of their voices, [the singing becoming] rather a unisonous scream than either concord or harmony.

This, however, is only a particular case of what as a generalization the Rev. William Romaine (1714-95) had expressed in his *Essay on Psalmody* (1775), a quarter of a century earlier:

> There are many in our congregations who seem to think that they sing best when they sing loudest. You may see them often strain themselves with shouting till their faces are as red as scarlet.

From this it would appear that the shouting of psalm tunes was not the peculiar characteristic of the early Methodists only, as has so often and so erroneously been supposed. The "shouting" of the psalmodic "captains" seems to have been an "unconscionable time a dying," since, as late as 1858, Surrey Tabernacle, in the Borough Road, advertised for a Precentor who in addition to various spiritual and educational attainments should not be one who would "bawl ready to split his throat," but should sing "easily and melodiously."

The first recorded efforts at definite psalmodic expression were associated with the instrumental rather than with the vocal part of the performance, with the accompaniment rather than with the melody. William Gawler (1750-1809), organist, composer, and publisher, in his *Harmonia Sacra* or "Collection of Psalm Tunes, with interludes, and a thorough bass" (London, 1781), says, with reference to the organ accompaniment to the metrical Psalms:

> When two verses are to be sung, they should both be played pretty full; when three, the first and last loud, the other soft; when four, the first and last loud, the intermediate two on the swell or choir organ, and the interlude before the last verse, which makes a pleasing variety.

This shows but little if any advance upon the mechanical method of eighty years before, which, as stated by the Rev. Arthur Bedford, in his well-known *The Great Abuse of Musick,* directed the use of

> Tunes of Triple Time for Psalms of Joy and Praise, and Tunes of Common Time with Semibreves in the middle for Psalms of Humiliation.

Still more remarkable is it to find Gawler's method supported, fifty years later, by no less authority that Dr. Crotch (1775-1847), sometime Professor of Music at Oxford, and the first Principal of the Royal Academy of Music, who, in his preface to his collection of psalm tunes issued in 1836, advises that

> The first and last verses may be played on the full organ, with the exception of the trumpet stop. The intermediate verses softer, as on the two diapasons of the full organ, or with the addition of the principal, but not so soft as to form an absurd contrast.

These methods may, perhaps, have been productive of a certain amount of variety; but, viewed from the standpoint of modern precept and procedure, one would imagine that the suggestions of Gawler and Crotch would often be more honoured in the breach than in the observance.

Towards the close of the eighteenth century, however, expression marks had already begun to creep into some of the more florid and repeating tunes of that period. Perhaps the earliest instance of this is to be found in Dr. Rippon's *Selection of Psalms and Hymn Tunes,* the first edition of which appeared in 1795. Rippon (1751-1836), as is well-known, was a Baptist minister, and his collection was primarily intended for Nonconformist use in connexion with his *Selection of Hymns* or *Appendix to Dr. Watts's Hymns and Psalms.* The tunes, 300 in number, were edited by Thomas Walker (1764-1827), a London composer of church music and an alto vocalist. In his "Brief Introduction to Psalmody," prefixed to the tunes, he asserts that

> It is by no means necessary to constitute a good singer, that he sing very loud; yet the conduct of some would lead us to think that this was the principal criterion, as they sing, or rather bawl, so exceeding loud that their faces are quite distorted with the violence done to harmony, while not only the tone of the voice, but the true sound of the note is destroyed by such undue exertions.

Walker adds that "expression is one of the greatest beauties in music," and in the more florid and repeating tunes, so often miscalled fugal, he has carefully and systematically inserted the abbreviations *p, f, or ff, pia., for., etc.,* these generally remaining in force for a line or section. Occasionally we find *cresc., dim., mez.p., meno p.,* and such *tempo* indications as grave, lively, solemn, moderate, brisk, *etc.* In Shrubsole's tune, "Miles Lane," the second and third iterations of the words "Crown Him," are marked *piano* instead of our *cresc.* or *forte.*

The elementary efforts of Rippon and Walker were continued by other workers and in other works. Thus, in 1833, Thomas Hawkes (1786-1857), of Williton, Somerset, modestly described by himself as "land agent and surveyor," issued his *Collection of Tunes,* "adapted to the Hymns in use by the Wesleyan Methodist Societies." Hawkes was assisted, as musical editor, by George Gay (1771-1833), a Wiltshire stonemason and musician, known in the former connexion as the builder of Melksham bridge, and, in the second, as the organist of Corsham Congregational Church, and the

builder of the country chapel known as "Gay's Meeting." This eccentric and self-taught musical genius, who wrote with facility hymn tunes in eight parts and published various anthems and at least one important psalmodic collection, came to a sad end, in a fit of insanity cutting through the carotid artery with his own mallet and chisel. Hawkes's plan was to put in parenthesis the titles of the repeating and expressive tunes; to place the "solemn tunes" on the left hand page of his oblong octavo volume, and the "more cheerful tunes" on the right hand page. He next remarks that while expression marks render "Anthems and set pieces" thereby capable of being, in this respect at least, "performed with safety," in

> Psalms and Hymns stanzas frequently vary so much from each other, that to sing all in the same way would show a want of taste, as *the sense would not agree with the sound.*

In order to meet this difficulty he suggests the changing of the tune for certain verses, especially "if the change be from a major to a minor key, and *vice versa.*" This method is familiar to all church musicians in what are known as "changeable" chants; but its application to psalmody is yet to seek. It might be worthy of consideration, and possibly rendered practical by indications in the hymn stanzas as to the particular tune to which each stanza or groups of stanzas should be sung. Throughout his work Hawkes has followed Rippon as regards the insertion of ordinary expression signs, but these are less numerous than in the older work. A large number of the tunes were written by West country amateurs. Some of the former, would be well worth resuscitation, *e.g.,* Geo. Gay's tune "Washford" to "Who is like Jeshurun's God?"

It is exceedingly interesting to note that while the first attempts at psalmodic expression were directed to the organ accompaniment rather than to the tunes themselves, the earliest indications of vocal expression were affixed to the music instead of to the words. The reverse is now entirely the case, this being largely due to the discontinuance of the florid tunes and "set pieces" of a century ago. But this reversal was a process which, if long delayed, was of remarkably rapid growth. Indeed in its sudden rise and fall it may be regarded as a kind of musical Jonah's gourd, since, as will be seen presently, the insertion of expression marks in modern hymnals is a practice not much more than half a century old, and is now rapidly becoming extinct. Such important hymnals of the earlier Victorian era as Goss's *Parochial Psalmody* (1826), Mercer's Church Psalter (1857), the first edition of *Hymns Ancient and Modern* (1861), and the *Appendix* (1868), the *Congregational Hymn Book* (1855), the *Hymnal Companion* (1870), and many others, had no expression marks whatever. But in 1848, that pioneer of choral, congregational, and community singing, the Rev. John Curwen (1816-1880), in his

Singing for Schools and Congregations, proposed and carried out a scheme whereby

> CAPITAL LETTERS in printing, or double lines under the words in writing should distinguish words to be sung LOUDER than others, [while] *italic* letters in printing, or a single line under the words, should indicate *softness.*

This method was adhered to by its originator in his *Child's own Hymn Book* (1855) and his *Sabbath Hymn and Tune Book* (1859). In the 1861 edition of this work Mr. Curwen suggests that

> If the singer feels that he can give the proper emotional and musical expression to the hymns, without any assistance, let him pay no attention whatever to the *Italic* or CAPITAL letters in which portions of the hymn are printed, or to the little words *piano, mezzo,* or *forte* which stand in the titles of the hymns. . . . The emotional commentary which our type supplies, is not meant to dictate but to help.

Mr. Curwen further exemplified his idea to a greater or lesser extent in his *Anthems, Canticles, and Hymns* (1864) and in his *Office of Praise* (1870).

Here we should not lose sight of the curious fact that the very first effort to apply expression marks to a modern hymnal implied the possibility of, and the reason for, their discontinuance, namely, the employment by the singers of their own musical intelligence. As this faculty developed indications of expression became more or less superfluous. The first hymnal to make systematic use of expression marks was Sir Joseph Barnby's *Hymnary* of 1872. In this the indications were general rather than particular, and were altogether wanting in some of the hymns. The work was followed, in 1874, by Sir Arthur Sullivan's *Church Hymns,* the expression marks being inserted by the Rev. W. Walsham How (1823-97); and, in 1875, appeared the revised edition of *Hymns Ancient and Modern,* in which the provision of expression marks was described in the preface as an "improvement." Meanwhile, in 1883, the same procedure was adopted by the Presbyterian *Church Praise*; in 1885, by Dr. Allon's *Congregational Psalmist;* in 1887, by the *Congregational Church Hymnal;* in 1898 by the Scottish *Church Hymnary*; and, in 1900, by the *Baptist Hymnal.*

But, as extremes generally meet, so from having an absence or a paucity of expression marks modern hymnals soon began to show a superfluity. Word-painting became common, and speedily aroused deserved hostile criticism. Writing to J. Cuthbert Hadden, W. T. Best (1826-97) said:

> In some hymns, for example in *Hymns Ancient and Modern,* the miserable editors are perpetually making alternate marks for shouting and whispering when "night" (*pp*) and "light" (*ff*) occur. Anything after sundown must be whispered, on principles probably connected with burglary. Thus Smart's tune to "Hark! hark! my soul," is made ridiculous by the parson editors dividing a couple of lines into a shout followed by a whisper.

Some years after this caustic criticism Hadden himself writes concerning Dr. A. H. Mann's *New Church of England Hymn Book* (1898) that in the matter of expression marks, it was about as bad as anything he had seen. "In fact," says he, "if I were inclined to levity I should be tempted to call the editor 'A Mann of marks'." This on account of such indications as:

f I long to be like Jesus,
p Meek, loving, lowly, mild;
f I long to be like Jesus;
p My Father's Holy Child.

These and other similar directions were characterized by Mr. Hadden as "absolutely grotesque," devoid of meaning and effect, and at once "spasmodic and jerky." Probably the happy medium was struck by F. G. Edwards (1853-1909), the editor of *Church Praise,* and, from 1897 to his death, editor of the *Musical Times.* In his book, *Common Praise,* he says that while

> expression, which is variety in tone, is absolutely necessary for an effective and true rendering of the words, [yet] natural feeling ought to dictate the places where loud or soft, *cres.* or *dim.,* should be introduced, but expression marks judiciously added to the hymn-books are indispensable in order to secure their simultaneous adoption by the whole congregation.

Exactly so, if the organist is prepared to follow these indications, and the latter are really worthy of the adjective "judicious." But, as we may infer from the criticisms recently quoted, the organists and Best's "parson editors" were far more often at variance than in agreement. Hence confusion resulted, and the popularity of expression marks became as ephemeral as it had been general. The last hymnal of real importance to employ these directions was the *Congregational Hymnary* of 1916—in this respect, as well as in most others, the finest collection of the century. But in the 1904 edition of the *Hymns Ancient and Modern,* in the so-called *"English" Hymnal,* in *Songs of Praise,* and in the recent Presbyterian *Church Hymnary,* these controversial marks are omitted altogether. In the present *Methodist Hymnal* the preface states:

> As to the rendering of the tunes, the Committee after careful consideration decided not to insert expression marks. In congregational singing only broad effects of light and shade are possible. Moreover, there is no invariable standard of expression. The higher musical intelligence now prevalent will determine the manner of rendering most suitable to the sentiment and the occasion.

Although this statement certifies on the part of the Committee the possession of considerable powers of faith and vision, the "higher musical intelligence" with which it seems to credit our congregations reminds us, after many years of experience in church music, of nothing so much as the Loch Ness monster whose existence has been

definitely determined but whose appearance is both infrequent and imperfect.

In *Hymns Ancient and Modern* (1904) the compilers announced in their preface that they had

> purposely avoided the general insertion of marks of expression, judging it better that organists and choirs should themselves interpret the spiritual and musical meaning of hymns and tunes.

Whether this abandonment of what in 1875 was regarded as one of many "improvements" was due to the opposition to and complete ignoring of these marks by competent organists and choirmasters and the consequent confusion of the congregation, or whether it was occasioned by a belief in the general progress of literary and musical preparedness, it would be difficult to say. Most probably, we venture to think, it was brought about by a recognition of the fact that in giving a lead to the congregation in the matter of expression, the organist is master of the situation and, as the *English Hymnal* wisely asserts, he can "convey his idea to the congregation by his registering." Into any controversy as to whether this statement is but another admission of what has been termed "the tyranny of the organ" I must decline to be drawn. Certain it is that it places upon the organist a tremendous responsibility. All who are deeply interested in church music will hope that in the matter of psalmodic expression this important functionary will be so adequately equipped as to be abundantly "sufficient for these things," and that his instrument will be "similar and similarly situated."

Orlando A. Mansfield.

A PLEA FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF CHURCH UNION IN SOUTH INDIA.

WHAT is written here is purely personal, not the outcome of any Conference or Committee, and therefore the first personal pronoun has in it a rather distasteful prominence. I want to ask my fellow-Congregationalists, alike laymen and brother ministers, whether we have as yet sought with sufficient seriousness to know the will of God on one of the greatest issues of our time, affecting the whole future of the Church, probably of the Church throughout the world. The last thing I want is to provoke the kind of controversy in which one side scores off another, but I do want to set the mind of the brethren working. I have no natural interest in ecclesiastical politics, and unless this proposed union is going to promote the fulfilling of the Church's missionary task and the actualizing of God's Kingdom in the earth I ought not to waste any time on it. But somehow in the quiet of last summer's holiday I seemed to be pressed to look again earnestly whether we Congregationalists are in this matter at present either listening for or obeying the voice of God. The pressure has not since abated, and it is this concern which I want to put before our churches.

In connexion with the whole L.M.S. situation, and equally in facing our home problems, we have all lately been seeking to discover some new source of power which would enable our churches not merely to provide for the Home ministry or to balance the L.M.S. budget, but to help to evangelize the world—in Britain, India, China, and everywhere. Thinking over various religious quickenings, some as different from each other as the Oxford Movement of a century ago and the Group Movement to-day, I seem to see that such quickenings came from a re-discovery or a new realization of some element in God's revealed truth, *e.g.*, the personal dealings with men of God's holy Spirit (Group Movement), or the meaning and value of the Church, her customs, practices, and above all her saints' experiences, in continuity with the early centuries (the Oxford Movement).

I wonder if for us to-day there is to be a fresh realization of God's meaning for the terms "Kingdom" and "Church" and of the relation between them. I think that somewhere in that region there is hidden the spring of that for which we are thirsting, which could fructify our barrenness as persons and as churches. If we could enter anew into what Jesus meant by the Kingdom, and then could understand how under the control of the divine Spirit the Kingdom fell a little into the background, while the Church, as the means by which it was to be realized on earth, came more into the foreground of Christian

thinking, our church life might become something new, Church membership might become the adventurous thing which it was in the early days of seeking first the Kingdom of God, and new things would happen in religion.

Going back to the Gospels I feel sure that the Lord Jesus did expect a corporate fellowship to perpetuate His Work after His earthly presence had ceased. The new compact between God and man (covenant) sealed by His death, pre-supposed a new Israel with whom it was made. That suggests thinking of the general Christian body as a people or nation (*1 Peter* 2) among the peoples and nations of the world. A nation can include a vast number of varieties, some of them mutually conflicting, within its unity; but it does have a constitution expressing great unities within which these varieties co-exist. It is only fair to bear this in mind when we are saying, as some Congregationalists do, that it is enough for us for small groups of believers to grow up here and there.

Then turning to Church history and looking again at such a book as Harnack's *Expansion of Christianity* one reads the weighty chapter in which he deals with the organization of the early Church, which he is convinced was a very potent factor in the spread of the Christian religion through the Roman Empire. Harnack was no episcopalian but impartially testifies to the great part played by the episcopate alike in the consolidation of the growing church and in the spread of Christianity beyond the church. So far as analogies with India hold, and I think they hold to quite a considerable degree, Harnack's evidence is in favour of episcopacy for the growing church in India facing the difficulties of the next two centuries. It leads me back again to wonder whether the things precious to us in our Congregationalism cannot be conjoined with the things precious to Episcopalians and to Presbyterians, of which we deprive the Church in India when we carry over only our British Congregationalism of to-day.

Leaving such considerations and looking at actual recent events, I see that the Methodists who at one time were not keen on this South India Scheme and who came into the discussion several years after the Congregationalists, have now taken action which, although it is not a final settlement, quite definitely sets their church facing towards union. The Conference of July, 1934 declared that "the Scheme of 1934, taken as a whole, is not contrary to the principles of Methodism." As far as the Methodists are concerned the matter is really decided. The Assembly of the Reformed Church of America (Presbyterian), which had been consulted by one of the Councils of the South India United Church connected with it as other Councils are connected with the L.M.S., recently voted by a large majority in favour of union. The Madura Council of the American Board (Congregationalist) has all along been wholly in favour. The Presby-

terians connected with the Church of Scotland, like ourselves, move slowly but seem to be moving towards acceptance. An important letter from the Assembly of the Church of Scotland in February, 1933, is couched in such terms that when read in the light of the proceedings of the Joint Committee on Union in 1934, which seem to concede all the points which it emphasizes, it constitutes a powerful encouragement to the Madras Council to join. There is just the L.M.S. left; and the Society which began on the most inclusive of ecclesiastical bases, and has led so many union movements in India, is applying heavy brakes at the rear end of this particular train. We may before long have even to consider what is to be our policy if we are left alone.

It was only natural and to be expected that Independents whether in India or in Britain would find most difficulty in coming into a large and rather elaborate organization. If there is some element for which we are trustees which would be destroyed by our joining with others in South India we must, if necessary, stand alone. On the other hand, if that something can be communicated to a larger body so that our distinctive witness in communion is stronger than in isolation, our right course will be plain. This means that our duty at the moment is re-examination. Hitherto the influence of the L.M.S. and of Congregationalism has on the whole counted against the Scheme. On the Field, while there is variety of opinion among missionaries, it is those who oppose who have felt it their duty to be most active, the others feeling that Indians must be left to deal with this matter for themselves. At home there is a good deal of ignorance of the Scheme and even the carefully drawn up Report of a Joint Commission of the Congregational Union and the L.M.S. is generally regarded as a warning more than an encouragement. It is so understood by people in India to whom it was sent as advice. Anyhow it was drawn up at the end of 1930, since when great changes have been made.

Incidentally I am affected in my approach to the study of the Scheme by personal knowledge of a number of people on the other side who have helped to frame it. Several of them, including three of the Bishops, are men alongside whom I have worked and prayed in Christian enterprises for many years. They are incapable of carrying out a mere astute ecclesiastical move, and in this cause they have withstood heavy attacks from extremists on their own side, as any reader of the *Church Times* can testify.

Surely we ought to give particularly careful study to the question how far the changes in the Scheme since 1930 have met the criticisms which our Joint Commission then made. I can only set down here my own impressions, which I want to see checked by the examination of experts, and by collective study of the documents.

(1) *Congregational Principles in the Scheme.* It was held in 1930 that the Congregational element was not sufficiently provided for. In the 1934 Scheme, under the heading "Necessary Elements in the Life of the United Church," the basis of union and the draft constitution contain notable paragraphs on "The Congregation in the United Church" which give what we want. To ask for more would be to ask for a stronger congregationalism than our churches in India have ever maintained for themselves.

(2) *The Apostles' and Nicene Creeds.* The reference to the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, which follows a clause accepting the Holy Scriptures "as containing all things necessary to salvation and as the ultimate standard of faith," remains unchanged as follows:

> They accept the Apostles' Creed and the Creed commonly called the Nicene, as witnessing to and safeguarding that faith, which is continuously confirmed in the spiritual experience of the Church of Christ, and as containing a sufficient statement thereof for a basis of union.

The use of the words of these Creeds is neither a condition of membership, nor a compulsory part of worship. Persons about to be ordained are required to affirm "a sincere belief in the truths witnessed to by the Nicene Creed." In this matter the Joint Committee has to consider not only the Methodists and former Anglicans, but great bodies like the Lutherans and Reformed Syrian Christian who should join some day and would not join a Church with less credal affirmation than this.

(3) *Episcopacy and the Powers of the Bishops.* The statements on these subjects have been much amended since 1930: I think everything that we asked in the Joint Commission's Report has been conceded, both as regards the interpretation of the term "historic episcopate" and as regards the powers of the bishops in ordination and their veto on certain subjects dealt with by Church Councils. Our recommendation that presbyters should participate in the laying-on of hands in all consecrations of bishops has been accepted with full appreciation of its significance and of its novelty, because something new in the history of the Church is being attempted, namely a combination of episcopal, presbyterian, and congregational church order.

(4) *The Ministry.* As regards the Ministry, the former provision of a thirty years' period of equal recognition of all ministries stands, with the following addition or alteration:

> After this period of thirty years, the united Church must determine for itself whether it will continue to make any exceptions to the rule that its ministry is an episcopally ordained ministry, and generally under what conditions it will receive ministers from other Churches into its ministry. It is trusted that in its consideration of these matters it

> will give full weight to the fundamental principles of the union, on the one hand that of a fully unified ministry within the Church, and on the other hand that of the maintenance and extension of full communion and fellowship with those Churches with which the uniting Churches now severally have such fellowship. It is understood that the status of those at that time already received as ministers in the united Church shall not be affected by any action which the united Church may then take.

The last sentence definitely meets a point raised by our Joint Commission. The first two sentences leave the door open for the Church thirty years hence to say that it will receive such people as L.M.S. Congregational ministers as full ministers of the United Church, thus providing for a permanent exception to the general rule of an episcopally ordained ministry. In the worst event, *i.e.*, if the United Church decided against such exceptions, it would receive such missionaries to exercise their ministry among its congregations, although they would not belong to the Church's own ministry (which would then be episcopal), just as we in Britain welcome ministers of other denominations as ministers of important churches of our own without asking them to become Congregationalists. The principle of the maintenance of full communion and fellowship with those Churches with which the uniting Churches now have such fellowship, taken along with the loyal feeling which Indian Churches have for the Home Churches which sent them the gospel, makes it in my opinion extremely likely that thirty years hence this united Indian Church, while making its own regular ministry episcopally ordained, will decide on arrangements by which ministers from our Churches may have full status in its own ministry, and quite certain that in any case it will give them free scope among the churches which their missionary society has helped to found.

(5) *Sacraments.* As regards Sacraments, there is no change in the wording "none except Presbyters and Bishops have the right to celebrate the Holy Communion." The expression "have the right to" is probably meant to leave it possible for Councils to make the kind of exceptions our Joint Commission suggested, but this is a point for further inquiry.

(6) *Position of Women.* New references provide for

> the exercise by lay persons, both men and women, of such gifts of prophecy, evangelization, teaching, healing and administration, as God bestows upon them. . . . Women shall be eligible for membership of the Synod and—unless any Diocesan Council provides otherwise—for membership of Diocesan Councils.

The question of the ordained ministry of women is a matter for the future, all round.

There will have to be careful and detailed study of all these points, not only in India, but here in Britain too. If the Church Councils

connected with the L.M.S. again ask advice, as they may do before long, the Joint Commission may have to be called together again[1]. But, without waiting for that, are we not all called to look again into this great matter lest our churches drift into obstructing some movement of the divine Spirit which may unite Christian forces for a truer witness in India? The future of Christ's Church in India is too momentous for us to leave the study of it to a few specialists.

What about the repercussion of this discussion at home? I believe the principles of this Scheme, if sound, have their application in Britain as everywhere else. But to mention only one or two differences between the two situations. In India the Church has already disestablished itself and in the South it consists mainly of Evangelicals. Future bishops, moreover, are to be elected by the Church, and about half of them will be of Free Church ecclesiastical descent, while their powers are declared by Principal Lofthouse to be less than those of Methodist Chairmen. The inter-denominational situation in Britain is immensely more difficult than in India, so that we could afford to take in India risks which we could not take in Britain. Nevertheless if the "all-inclusiveness" of the South India Scheme is right it should be possible within a generation or two to discover its true application to the British situation. We cannot see so far ahead, but I do not think this Scheme sets our faces in the wrong direction.

One of the things which has worried me most is that the provisions of this Scheme would seem to exclude from the contemplated Church certain of my less "orthodox" friends without whom our own churches would be immeasurably poorer. But as I have reflected it has seemed to me that these are exceptional people who would be excluded even from our own Church if there were any rigid insistence on its unwritten rules regarding creed or practice. The same large-heartedness which has enabled Congregationalism to hold the allegiance of such men even when they contradicted vital elements in its teaching might enable the contemplated united Church too to hold them as exceptions. Its constitution is a setting up of standards for the ordinary, not the exceptional.

Another question is whether the forces which have in the West led to various breakings away from large Church bodies will not so operate in India that within thirty or forty years various bodies will leave this united Church and become Indian "nonconformists." It may be so, for none of us can forecast the future, though I think the Indian temperament will rather tend towards great looseness and variety within one large body than towards the formation of separate bodies. But if there are to be separations from this large Church, it will be better if they are Indian separations based on real differences

[1] Since this was sent to the press, one Council has written for advice.

in Indian Christian experience instead of based as they are at present upon European and British historical divisions without reality to Indians. And where there is no State connexion of either body, the difference involved in "nonconformity" will be freed from that which makes it most troublesome in England. I think I should feel it right, even if I believed as some do that differences of church organization must always exist to meet the need of different types of religious disposition, to try to provide India with one great Church for Indians themselves to break away from when they find some overwhelming reason for such breakaway. It is wrong to provide them with artificial Western divisions.

We shall be asked, Do you really expect that Congregationalists in Britain will help through the missionary society to support an episcopal Church in India? The question is wrongly worded, for the term "episcopal Church" suggests to most of us something very different from this proposed Church which has strong congregational and presbyterian as well as episcopal elements. It may well prove that Congregationalists in Britain, when once they realize the interest and boldness of this attempt to meet the needs of India, will be more keen to support it than to provide India with an imitation of our own denominational arrangements.

But the need of the hour is fresh consideration of the whole subject. Copies of the 1934 edition of the Scheme of Union may be obtained from the L.M.S. Bookroom, or from the Independent Press (1s.,; 1s. 1d. post free). Ministers' Fraternals would be appropriate first places for discussion, especially if someone from one of the other denominations concerned, Methodist or Anglican, could be invited to take part. The subject could then be canvassed in church gatherings, especially for young people, again if possible with well-informed representatives of other Churches. Out of such discussion might even come suggestions which could influence the final shaping of the Scheme. We owe important improvements to the very active part taken for the last few years by the Methodists, and I am a little jealous that recently we ourselves have made so little constructive contribution.

But let us not get entangled in details, or confused by our small preferences or conveniences of missionary organization. Looking not at the decades but the centuries, not at the Church temporarily leaning on the mission but at the Church of India when the missionary scaffolding will have been removed, what is God's will for the future? Nothing less than that is what we have to discover.

G. E. Phillips.

SOME ISSUES CONFRONTING THE MINISTRY TO-DAY.

THREE great issues are becoming increasingly serious for the modern minister. The first is the economic. It is in this realm that the basic cause of the world's profound unrest is to be found. During the past hundred and fifty years we have unlocked the energy stored up in coal, oil, natural gas, and other resources of Nature, and harnessed this power for the doing of our work. It is now possible for one man to do by the stroke of his hand what a thousand slaves never did. One turbine engine can generate more energy than all the working population of ancient Egypt. Particularly in America have we so perfected our high power machines that we have definitely emerged from an economy of scarcity into an economy of plenty. Whereas the civilizations of the past, all of them, were constrained by an energy limit of not more than 4,000 kilogramme calories *per capita* we in the United States of America have forty times the energy limit of all earlier cultures. The significant fact for us to grasp—and it is so revolutionary that it is difficult to grasp it—is that for the first time in human history it is now possible to give every man, woman, and child in the United States of America the material basis for the good life. When our present machines with our present managerial efficiency can turn out three times as many shoes, five times as many dresses, four to five times as many suits and overcoats, and other goods in like proportion, as they have ever turned out it is evident that physically speaking the economic problem is solved.

But why only physically speaking? Why have we only the productive power and not the actual production? The answer becomes increasingly clear. Our economists and our industrial engineers are more and more making the same point. That point is this, that a way of doing things which was reasonably satisfactory when about the only engine was the human engine just doesn't work when the human engine becomes of relatively little importance beside the mechanical engine which is displacing it. The old way of doing things was individualistic, or at most it required a few men working together in small units. The new way demands the assembling and co-operating of masses of men in large units. One man might make a wagon but it takes thousands to make an automobile. Moreover, the various industries under high power machine production are mutually dependent upon each other. The new way is collectivistic. It demands that the labour of thousands, even millions, be co-ordinated. To use an expression that has become trite, but which is nevertheless true, to employ the machine technique to anything like its capacity our production must be planned.

Now it becomes more evident every day that no real planning with the interest of the whole people at heart can be made except by governmental authority. This means that our basic industries at least will have to be controlled by governmental authority used to produce what the people actually need. In fact, it comes down to this, that such a step *must* be taken or else the machine technique itself will gradually be abandoned and the economic salvation it promises slip from our grasp. The plain fact is that our system of private control for private profit is incompatible with a high energy civilization. Yet to take our basic industries out of the hands of their private owners is a most difficult undertaking. There is little reason for thinking that these owners will surrender the mighty power and privilege which they now wield without a terrific battle. Every resource that they have, and they have many, will be brought into the struggle. This is the real meaning of the fascist victory in Italy and Germany. It is the real reason for the increasing talk of fascism in England and America. The fascist movement is the final battle waged by the great private owners of the industrial process. In that battle legal forms and old established personal rights are ruthlessly swept aside and private ownership is preserved at all costs.

Here is one of the greatest issues that confronts the minister to-day. Where is he going to stand in this conflict? The machine technique can lay the economic foundation for the good life for all. But it cannot do this for the children of men unless those machines are consciously used for that beneficent purpose. That means the abandonment of the private ownership and control of this industrial process. But this will be opposed by those who now own that process. Where will the minister stand? Will he stand for that policy which alone can make our new high-energy civilization a benefit to the children of men, or will he line up with those who to-day oppose such social ownership by every legal means and to-morrow will express their hostility in an American or English version of Hitlerism? Such is the basic issue we as ministers have to face.

It is obvious that as we face this issue another problem will grow out of it; we shall be compelled to decide what methods are lawful for a Christian to use in this mighty economic battle. This will mean that we must clarify our attitude in regard to strikes, boycotts, and other methods of social pressure. We must decide, and it will not be easy, what methods necessarily involve hatred and are thus ruled out by the Christian ethic.

But there is a second issue which we cannot escape. That issue is war and the relationship of our Christianity to it. It is obvious that this issue is closely tied up with the one we have just discussed, for most of the seeds of modern war are found in the economic process as it is now operating. The profits of the machine technique have

flowed into a relatively few hands, and those few seek the most favourable opportunities to re-invest them. Those opportunities are to a large extent found in industrially backward countries. Thus there is a rivalry for those opportunities among the investors of the great machine nations. Those machines, too, demand raw materials, and the supply is not unlimited. But above all there is a rivalry for the markets of the world. Out of those rivalries for investment opportunities, for raw materials, and for markets, there comes that friction and ill will which leads to war. That was the underlying reason for the Great War—as Woodrow Wilson himself confessed, and that is why Japan fought China for Manchuria. And this basically is why the world continues to arm. This is why we here in the United States are embarking on the greatest peace time naval programme we ever had, a programme costing us substantially a billion dollars. Of course, it is too easy an analysis to say that all war is due to the private ownership of the industrial machine. There are other causes at work. But the fact is that the nations are once more piling up their armaments. Japan, France, England, the United States, Russia—all are in it. This brings before the Christian to-day, and certainly before the Christian leader, the searching question as to where he will stand when war comes.

Most of us well recall the pitiful capitulation of the Church and our revered leaders in it to the war spirit a few short years ago. Dr. Abrams, of the University of Pennsylvania, has told the shameful story in *Preachers Present Arms*. As a matter of fact the church of Jesus Christ just folded up and declared a moratorium on the Sermon on the Mount. A leading preacher in Philadelphia could say,

> No line can be drawn between Christianity and patriotism and every Presbyterian Church should be a recruiting station.

But that is all past: what matters now is where we shall stand when the war drums beat again.

No matter what one's final decision may be the fact is plain that war presents an awesome issue for the Christian minister. There is hate in war, for wars cannot be waged without hatred. There is the most heartless violation of personality in war, and reverence for personality lies very close to the heart of the Christian ethic. This is the issue, however, that as Christian ministers we are likely to face in all its stark reality if our economic paradox is not resolved. We are going to be compelled to say where we stand on the issue of war. Shall we refuse to have part in it or shall we do as most of us did in the war with Germany, go over so wholeheartedly to the war makers that there is little to distinguish between the Christian minister and General Pershing, except possibly that the latter stood a little straighter? And as for helping the conscientious objector the average minister said like Peter, "I tell you I never knew the man."

Yes, we must face up to the issue of war. And that implies that we must take some attitude toward these huge naval appropriations which inevitably increase the tension between America and Japan and England. We must decide, too, whether we can co-operate with the war machine to the extent of serving as chaplains in it. I have heard some say that they objected to the Kirby Page questionnaire on war this last winter because they did not want to take a stand in advance, not knowing what the day would bring forth. We must think out our stand in advance or it is a moral certainty that we shall say, "Well, this is a righteous war, and it must be fought." We must face the issue now while we can think calmly.

Ministers must face the economic issue and the war issue. These are enough, but even they are not all. There is another issue which in a sense combines them and poses the question to us Christians. By a curious turn of the wheel of time an old conflict is again arising. This is the conflict which the early Christians fought with Rome, the conflict in which the blood of the first martyrs was shed. Once more the idea of the God-State is emerging, and men are being asked to yield not only their property and their lives but their very sense of justice and right to the nation. Once more the State is endeavouring to stamp out any loyalty that looks beyond itself. We see this phenomenon in Germany, where the new Hitler government tried to make the Church a servile handmaiden to the Nazi State. We see it too in Soviet Russia, where the Government would outlaw religion altogether. We see it in Italy, where Mussolini, although an atheist at heart, would use the Catholic Church as a national unifying force and stamp out all religious dissent from it. We see it in Japan, where, as in ancient Rome, the Emperor becomes a symbol of the State and one hundred per cent loyalty to him is demanded. We see it very definitely in our own United States, where the doctrine is arising that no one can be a citizen unless he is willing to fight in any war which Congress may declare, no matter what religious scruples he may have against it.

Just how far we have already gone along the path of deifying the State is shown by the religious ritual which all countries are building up about it. There is a national anthem, a hymn of praise, which must be sung with the greatest respect and fervour. And we must rise when it is sung or played. Then there is the flag, which must be displayed in a prescribed way and in no other. Rules and regulations are laid down as to how it is to be washed and how destroyed when it has become worn and threadbare. Moreover, the salute to it is definitely prescribed and made a part of the curriculum of our schools. There can be no disputing the fact that public opinion is to a large extent backing up all this. Nationalism is becoming in very truth "Man's Other Religion." And, we may add, this "other

religion" is to millions more real and potent than any of the historic faiths.

I believe I can bring this home to you by asking you to think for a moment of what would happen if one were to take a Bible or a cross and tear or break it in pieces or trample upon it before an audience of average Americans. The audience would not like it, but one would not be in bodily danger if he were guilty of such an act. But think for a moment of what would happen if one were to take the American flag and deliberately trample on it or rend it in twain. A man would be lucky if he escaped without being maimed, and certainly he would be hauled into the courts and sent to prison. Some may recall how Bouck White in New York City burned the flags of all the nations in 1916 or thereabouts in token of international unity, and the six months sentence he drew for it. Now I am not for one moment advocating that either the Bible, the cross, or the flag, or any other religious or national symbol, should be treated with anything but respect, but I am pointing out that the whole drift in our world to-day is toward the deification of the State much in the same way as the Roman Empire deified it. This re-emergence of the God-State is creating a tension in the religious life of man whether he be Christian or Jew, Moslem or Buddhist. It makes a burning issue for ministers.

And why cannot religion resign itself to this development? Why cannot it accept the State as its God and fall down and worship it? Why cannot it be content to play a subordinate rôle? The answer lies in the very nature of religion, whether that religion be Christianity or Judaism or any other faith. Religion is the consciousness of having direct and personal relations with the universal power which controls the course of nature and human life. True religion always implies a cosmic reference. It is the assertion that there are absolute and eternal values, values which demand the utter devotion of man. Historically it never has tolerated, and as long as it remains itself can never tolerate, any usurpation of this supreme place in the heart of man. True religion demands always that man's first loyalty be to God and the eternal and absolute values which that term implies. The basic attitude of religion was well expressed by the Apostle Peter when he and others were hauled before the Council.

> Then Peter and the other apostles answered and said, We ought to obey God rather than men.

Religion must oppose the deification of the State because this God-State, mighty and powerful and worthy as it may be considered, itself is after all but a part, a very little part, of the whole reality for which man always longs. Allegiance to a geographical locality is a poor substitute for allegiance to the Almighty God of beauty, truth, and justice.

Moreover, it must never be forgotten that Judaism and Christianity and other ethical religions have continuously insisted upon reverence for personality. The God-State does not hesitate to sacrifice human personality in the interest of itself. It tells its citizens what they must do and what they must think. For the individual it cares little or next to nothing. If it needs his life in war it takes it ruthlessly and with no compunction. How different all this from true religion, which makes personality and reverence for it its basic principle. It looks upon all men as the children of one Father. It opposes the narrow nationalistic view of the State. It teaches that men are equal in the sight of God, and it looks forward to the realization of a world —a whole world, not just one land—based on brotherhood.

In thus exposing the cleavage which is growing in our modern world between the worship of the universal God and the worship of the God-State I am not oblivious of the fact that some will say that no civil State can exist unless it is to have full and complete authority. Thus these folk would say to me: "What you are preaching is nothing but anarchy." I deny that charge most emphatically. The really religious man will obey the State except in the most extreme cases. He will not frivolously, or merely to satisfy his own desires or appetites, defy its laws or decrees. He will not lightly stand out against it. He will so stand out only when it is a matter of fundamental conscience, when he knows that he must obey God rather than man. Moreover, it is to be noted as a matter of historical record that the Quakers and the Mennonites and other sects opposed to certain phases of the claim of the State have co-operated with it in all but the most exceptional cases. They have followed the rule of Christ to render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and unto God the things that are God's. But in that realm of conscience they have believed God to be supreme rather than Cæsar. Moreover I would point out that such outstanding churchmen as Dr. Fosdick, Bishop McConnell, and dozens of others who would stand out resolutely against any war they thought unjust, cannot be considered anarchistic in any rational use of that word. Indeed, these men believe that in being true to their God they are in the highest sense being true to their country. Only this they will not do—they will not give their country the worship that belongs to God. In the words of the Westminster Confession of Faith:

> God alone is Lord of the conscience and has left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men.

By a strange turn of the historical process the mood and manner of ancient Rome is again upon us. Once more men seek to attain a full and complete national unity. Once more they are learning to hate the suggestion that there can be anything greater than the State. Once more we have a nationalism which would deny justice

and the essential oneness of mankind. Once more we have a spirit which would compel the individual to do what he believes to be wrong. Once more the devil is saying to the worshippers of the cosmic God, "All this will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me." But the religious man can never cease to seek for justice and brotherhood and peace, no matter how much a God-State would strive to compel him otherwise. God grant that we religious folk may not have to make the choice, but if we do may we have the courage and the stamina to say as did those youths described in *Daniel* when they were asked to violate their conscience by worshipping the image of gold set up by the king as a test of loyalty.

> O Nebuchadnezzar, we are not careful to answer thee in this matter. If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and he will deliver us out of thine hand, O king. But if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up.

There speaks the voice of true religion, a voice that Rome could not still and a voice which will be heard when our modern Cæsars are laid in the dust and even the God-State is but a memory.

This brief survey of the economic issue, the war issue, and the issue of the State, all of them terrifying issues facing the ministry to-day and the years just ahead, makes it abundantly clear that the ministry is not going to be an easy calling. In fact the time may come when Christians will once more meet in secret as they did in ancient Rome. Once more the words of our Father will have meaning for his followers: "I send you forth as sheep among wolves."

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE.

A NEW OUTLOOK IN CHRISTIAN MISSIONS.

It was said recently of a certain class of people that they were trying to face post-war problems with a pre-war mentality. Again and again in Church history have we found the Church facing the problems of its day with a mentality belonging to a previous day. The last twenty years have witnessed such changes in thought and advances in knowledge that we must ask ourselves whether we are facing the challenges of to-day with a pre-war mentality or even with a nineteenth century mentality in many cases. This article is not specially concerned with the problems that face the Church in western lands, but rather with those that face the missions of the Church in foreign lands, and particularly in India.

It is not possible for many Christians to retain their faith in missions on the old basis of the supplanting of the ethnic religions by the religion of Christianity. Dr. Fleming's book *Sharing with Other Faiths,* has given a very good analysis of the various attitudes adopted by missionaries to other faiths. We have seen these attitudes change remarkably during the past fifty years from radical antagonism to deep sympathy and friendliness. The Edinburgh Conference of 1910 marked the change from antagonism to sympathy, and the Jerusalem Conference of 1926 went further and even hinted at the possibility of sharing and co-operation. Unfortunately the delegates to that Conference did not fully face some of the deeper issues that were presented, especially by the delegates from India, but allowed themselves to be frightened by the bugbear of "syncretism," forgetting that Christianity as we have it to-day is a syncrasis of Judaism, Hellenism, Roman organization, nationalistic idealisms, and other streams of thought, together with the teaching of Christ as revealed in the Synoptics and interpreted by the Church.

One thing that the Jerusalem Conference expressed we must all be grateful for, and that is the fact of "the ever-unfolding revelation of Jesus Christ," and this may perhaps give us the key to the new attitude which is being adopted more and more on some mission-fields. The Christianity that we know to-day is not even the final expression of the teaching of Jesus Christ that we may know from the Gospels. The Jerusalem Conference also accepted the fact of the enrichment of the Christian interpretation of life by the interpretations of the ethnic religions, thus pointing the Church towards a new ideal for missions.

There is no doubt that until the end of the nineteenth century missions were dominated almost entirely by the ideal of what, for want of a better word, we must call "proselytism." By "proselytism" I mean the bringing into the Christian Church and into the Christian

religion, as it is organized, those who are members of other religious communities. The aim of missions was not simply to carry the message of Christ and to express His ideals by life and teaching, but definitely to win those outside to the Christian conception of life and duty as expressed in the Church. There is a worthy as well as an unworthy form of proselytism, and I do not think that we have any grounds for charging the majority of missionaries, or even a large number of them, with the adoption of the unworthy form. They sincerely believed that acceptance of the doctrines of Christianity as taught by the Church and entrance into the Church by means of baptism were necessary for temporal good and eternal bliss. They had found in this and by these means a joy and a power which they could not find elsewhere, and which meant to them a wonderful enrichment of life, and they were eager for others to share in this precious possession. These are not unworthy motives, and the proselytism that was based upon them was not unworthy of the Christian Church. Nor should we suggest that they were blameworthy. They lived up to the highest they knew and threw everything they had into this life of unselfish giving. Harnack tells us that the Jewish advocates of proselytism were as highminded and as sincere as their nineteenth century successors. He says:

> They never did anything to lower or compromise the moral demands of their faith. They rigorously insisted on the recognition of God from all their proselytes with all His claims upon their service.

Yet Jesus found it necessary to utter His scathing condemnation of the proselytizing fervour. The Ethiopic version of the saying which reads "to baptise one proselyte," is still more pointed and appropriate.

It is one of the unfortunate results of the dominance of this motive of proselytization that Hindus and Moslems find it hard to rid themselves of a suspicion that all the good and Christlike service of missions and individual missionaries has as its main object the increase in the numbers attached to Christian religious organizations. They find it hard to believe in the fundamentally unselfish character of our work, and again and again I have found that interested motives are imputed where none existed. Sometimes the truly Christlike spirit of a strong personality, like Dr. Miller of Madras or Dr. Kugelberg of Guntur, breaks through all such prejudices and is accepted for what it really is. But everyone who has worked in India knows the barrier to understanding that this prejudice has raised.

Further than this, the proselytizing motive has obscured the revelation of the personality of Jesus Christ and has tended to make it difficult for men to realize that it is He and not the Church or the Christian organization which is foremost in our thought. In our reports, which Hindus read as well as Christians, we have stressed far too much the number of baptisms and admissions into the

Church, and far too little the growing reverence for the teaching and personality of Christ among those outside the Church. It has been a common belief among many that Christian workers, including missionaries, are paid in accordance with the number of converts! It is a tragic fact that men have found it difficult to see the glorious vision of Christ because of our insistence upon the ecclesiastical and organizational aspects of the Christian life as it has come down to us in our western heritage.

Not only so, but this emphasis upon baptism and the Church has made men refuse to have anything to do with a Jesus Who comes apparently clothed in the trappings of western ecclesiasticism. A Hindu friend, who is as good a Christian outside the Church as are many of us who are inside, said to me the other day: "Behind Jesus Christ are the paraphernalia of foreign ecclesiastical, political, and economic organization and the devout Hindu does not want them." It was Bernard Lucas, a missionary of the London Missionary Society, who many years ago uttered a clear warning against this dominance of the proselytizing motive. He was ahead of his days, but more and more missionaries are coming to realize that any form of proselytization, even the best, is injurious to the real spiritual work to which we are called. It is one of the most remarkable characteristics of the mind of Jesus that though He was a member of the Jewish race, which was in His day the most enthusiastic proselytizer in the world, there is not a trace of the proselytizing spirit in His teaching. Even Paul, His greatest disciple, cannot get away from this attitude, a fact which an Indian Christian with his sensitive spirit has pointed out. C. F. Andrews in his recent book, *What I owe to Christ,* quotes these words of S. K. Rudra:

> Charlie, I find it difficult sometimes to read St. Paul's Epistles. He is like you Englishmen—always trying to force someone to his own point of view and "compassing sea and land to make one proselyte." Christ Himself is free from such forceful methods to obtain success. His great parable is that of the seed growing secretly. The East understands that hidden growth.

I do not wish to say much about the grave moral dangers that always lurk in the dominance of the proselytizing motives. We have seen far too much of them in missionary history in India and elsewhere. Only recently a Judge of the High Court in Allahabad had to call the attention of one of the largest and most respected missions in India to the grave abuses to which this attitude had given rise. These are things that no serious and truthful missionary seeks to defend.

I have written thus about the motive of proselytization because I truly and earnestly believe that the attitude of which this is the expression is alien to the mind of Christ and gravely injurious to

the cause of His Kingdom, and I am anxious to see other motives become dominant in our missionary work.

There is one further aspect of this subject that must be considered before I can pass on to suggest what, to my mind, is the truer attitude. Any form of proselytism inevitably implies some measure of regimentation of opinion and belief. To the mind of the proselytizer certain beliefs are of such fundamental importance that everyone must hold them. If they do not then, in the words of St. Paul, "Let them be anathema." That attitude may have been intellectually possible in the nineteenth century, but it is hardly so in the second quarter of the twentieth century when science is making clear the relativity of all our knowledge. The fact that I or a large group of people believe a certain thing is not sufficient reason why everyone should believe it in that same way, or at any rate why I should insist on them doing so. Education is not concerned to-day so much with teaching people things that others have learnt as with teaching them to find out things for themselves in their own way. It has been said that Indian Christianity has not yet justified itself because it has not produced a single heresy. If this be true, the reason for it is largely the emphasis upon regimentation of belief resulting from our proselytizing methods of work. That fellowship is needed for the growth of the Christ life, and that all fellowship involves some measure of agreements, is fully admitted. That the Christian Church has a great part to play in India as elsewhere is wholeheartedly accepted, but it must be a Christian Church shaped and moulded by the people of Christ in India and not forced into a western mould. The mind of Jesus as we know it from the Synoptic Gospels does not lend itself to this regimentation of belief in any form. He has no use for labels or orthodoxies and is only concerned that men should follow the guidance of the Spirit in their search for God's truth. He never attempted to create an organization bound by ecclesiastical or theological limitations. This was the heritage of Rome and its Empire to the Christian Church. Jesus claimed the right to think for Himself and to express His experience of God in His own way and so came up against the authority of the Pharisees. His uniqueness shines out perhaps more in this than in anything else. In an age of authority He believed in freedom. This did not mean that He despised authority or set aside useful institutions such as the synagogue. We know from the Gospels that He accepted and used all that seemed good to Him in the institutions and teaching of His people. He had a twentieth century mind, and the fortieth century will surely find in Him the mind of the fortieth century too. Unfortunately His immediate followers could not follow Him then, and the pressure of Roman organization soon drove out this spirit of Christlike freedom from the Church.

To-day science has come to the aid of lovers of freedom and made it impossible for reasonable men to think along the lines of a regimentation of belief or opinion. The Church cannot possibly escape the influence of this time spirit, and it will be found more and more difficult to insist on certain special moulds for faith and belief. We shall also find it easier to enter more completely into that freedom with which Christ has endowed us and to trust more fully to the influence of His spirit rather than to theological or ecclesiastical traditions.

This brings me to the more positive aspect of this article. What should be the outlook and method of our missionary work to-day in order that we may come into harmony with this understanding of Christ's mind? The Jerusalem Missionary Conference indicated one of its most important aspects when it suggested that the younger and older Churches were co-partners and that the religions of the world might co-operate with the Christian Church in its attack on the forces of secularism. Dr. Mott in his preface to the short account of the Conference went further and specified it as an attitude of "sharing." This word seems to me to express one aspect of the modern missionary attitude. Sharing implies something to share on both sides. The Jerusalem Conference expressed its belief in the need for a sharing with the ethnic faiths in the fine things which were revealed in those faiths. Those of us who have come into contact with Hindu religious experience believe that we have much to gain from that experience, just as we have much to give. The emphasis in the past has been largely on the side of giving. It is natural that those who have had experience of the revelation of God the Father in Christ should feel intensely the great value of that gift and should wish to share it with others. Such a one-sided attitude, however, generally tends to breed a superiority complex which makes it difficult for us to see anything in the other's religious experience in which we too may share. There is no doubt that this superiority complex, however it may have been qualified by a loving and a humble spirit, has prevented men of earnest religious devotion in other faiths from realizing the great value of the contribution we have to make to their religious life. It is far easier for men to be willing to learn from those who are themselves anxious to learn. While sharing implies an "open" mind it does not imply an empty mind. The whole missionary idea stresses the importance of the gift that the missionary has, but if it leads to the consciousness that the other has nothing to give then it passes into religious pride which is fatal to true evangelism. A Missionary Director once asked me somewhat jokingly, but with enough seriousness to show that he was not willing to accept an ideal of sharing, "What has an Oxford man got to learn from any Indian?" My reply was also jocular: "You had better ask a Cambridge man"; but we must admit that this kind of religious pride has spoilt some of the best missionary work.

The older missionary ideal was expressed in the missionary methods of those days—preaching and class teaching. The people were hearers and learners only and the missionary was the teacher. The new ideal is expressed in groups of seekers, who share with one another what each has to give. I have myself been a member of such groups and have seen how this method can bring together earnest men of all religious faiths and can create an atmosphere of sympathy in which religious longings and experience can find sincere expression.

As Christians we cannot but value all that the Church is to us and all that it has meant, and we have the right to believe that if it lives up to the ideals of its Lord and Master it will also find a value in the eyes of those who to-day are outside. The motto of the Church of Rome, *Semper Eadem,* is not our motto for the Church to-day, but rather the motto, "Ever changing," always growing in accordance with the unfolding relevation of God. The Christ we love to-day is something more than the Christ we loved yesterday because we have come to know something more about Him in our own experience. True, as *Hebrews* says, He is the same in Himself, and all that we have known, that we know, and that we shall know is in Him and we do not add anything to Him, but we add to our experience of Him, and unless we do this we are not in the true apostolic succession, still pressing forward to the unattained and still growing up into the full stature of His manhood.

There is one question that naturally comes into our minds. Will this attitude of sharing evoke the same eagerness and enthusiasm, the same wonderful self-sacrifice as the older attitude of a one-sided giving evoked? That depends partly upon the value that we attach to what we have to share and partly upon the value we attach to the Kingdom of God. I have seen the work of Miss Jane Adams and her colleagues at Hull House built upon this ideal of sharing, and none can deny the spirit of self-sacrifice and eager service evoked by it. But we may go further back still. The first missionary to India of whom we have trustworthy historical records—Pantænus—came from the Church of Clement and Origen, which in the early Christian era represented this spirit of sharing. It is Clement who claims the philosophy of Greece as part of the great covenant of God and a *pædagogus* to lead men to Christ. It is he who claims every truth as part of the whole truth, and who finds it not only in Jewish prophecy or in Christian Gospel but also in Greek philosophy. The incarnation visualizes this great truth of sharing from God's side. He showed how He wished to share with men in their thoughts and ideals. The Incarnation is not only a revelation of God but also a Divine sharing with man and a picture of the Divine method of leading men to higher things. He comes not only to speak but also to hear.

It has come about, somehow, that the ideal of the Kingdom of

God, which was the central idea of Christ's life and teaching, has been obscured, and in its place we have substituted the ideal of the Church, a human organization. The Kingdom of God is something which has to do primarily with God and His spirit, and is fundamentally spiritual. The Church, *ecclesia,* is an assembly of people, organized for special purposes, and it has not always shown itself in harmony with the ideals of the Kingdom of God as expressed by Christ. If we believe in the Kingdom of God we shall be ready to work for that Kingdom and to give ourselves to the service of the King, Whose sphere of rule is as wide as humanity itself. The spiritual Kingdom of God cuts across boundaries of Church and religion, and is found in loving and truthful souls in all lands and peoples and creeds. It is not those who say, "Lord, Lord," who shall enter His Kingdom, but those who "do the will of the Father in Heaven."

We find men of science sharing with one another the secrets they have wrested from the universe not for the sake of gain, nor for the sake of any particular theory or organization, but for the sake of humanity. We see them living in penury, giving up the ordinary comforts of life, and even risking their lives just for this ideal of sharing some great truth for the good of humanity. Shall men of religion be unwilling to do the same?

H. A. Popley.

Dr. G. P. Hedley's *A Christian Year* (Macmillan, 8s. 6d.) contains 52 meditations for a revised modern Calendar, which includes selected Church Festivals and Saints' Days, and also Mothers' Day, Independence Day, Labour Day, Armistice Day, and Thanksgiving Day. Dr. Hedley is a sound scholar of wide learning, and it is interesting to find him addressing himself to a task of this kind.

When we began *The Ivory Spires* (Epworth Press, 5s.) we thought that at last we were going to be satiated with Dr. F. W. Boreham; and certainly in the first essays he seems to be running to adjectives more than ever. Before the end, however, he cast his spell on us once more: Part II is much better than Part I, with "A Factory Girl's Holiday"—the story of Pippa's day—specially well done.

The Rev. Thomas Tiplady's personality does not get across the printed word in all the papers in *The Tower and the Cross* (R.T.S., 1s.), but in some of them, and notably "Changing the Guard," there is the vigour and intensity we have noticed in his previous writings. There he really gets home—and we imagine he is a better preacher than poet.

SHAKESPEARE'S RELIGION.

In Mr. G. B. Shaw's striking and much discussed little book, *The Adventures of the Black Girl in her Search for God,* there is a statement to the effect that Shakespeare has no use for God, with the implication, as one supposes, that this is an argument for not believing in the God of Christian theology. One's mind first of all reacted to this statement by recalling the numerous references to religion and the Bible in Shakespeare's works, and reflecting that not a few books have been written exhibiting the religious elements in his writings. Later came the impression gained from re-reading his works that the religious references were all made *in character,* with the exception of a few rather obscure ones in the Sonnets, and that there is but little of Christian metaphysic running through the plays. Still the impulse was felt to prove that Shakespeare was at heart a Christian, *anima naturaliter Christiana,* as we all desire to see in our great national poet the qualities that we ourselves approve. One felt moved to show that Shakespeare's moral views of life, and strong delineation of a retributive fate overtaking wrong and unfaithfulness and social defection, constitute a kind of inchoate religion which enables us to place him among the teachers of spiritual truth.

But further reading and reflection, especially on the great Tragedies, seem to prove that Shakespeare had a very definite view-point which may be briefly summed up as Humanism. He was the greatest of Humanists, and belongs to the band of bold and original thinkers, such as Montaigne, Rabelais, Bacon, and Marlowe, who definitely revolted again the dogmatic systematization of the Scholastics and against medieval superstition, and resolved to erect life on a basis of reason and original research. Shakespeare appears to do his own thinking, without any ready-made helps from Christian theology. He is to be taken seriously in his profound studies of human character and destiny, and of the problem of evil. His unaided research lands him mainly in negative or inconclusive results. Some of his finest characters, such as Kent in *King Lear,* express again and again only a sad agnosticism, or relegation of human fates to fortune or chance. Shakespeare believes that evil exists, and a spirit of evil in the world, perhaps a mass-product of human degeneration, which may seize on and use as its instruments hapless souls like Macbeth and his wife, Iago, and Edmund, Goneril, and Regan in *King Lear.* Yet at the same time, and in nearly every play, there are natures noble and beautiful that redeem human life and give it worth and meaning. In such characters the poet has a deep and enthusiastic interest. He is impatient of all theories, movements, and politics, and concentrates on human lives, as a dramatist would naturally do. He has a marvellous gift of realizing character, of getting inside it,

and being it, as Browning constantly laboured to do, sometimes with success, but hardly with the triumphant ease and power of Shakespeare. But there is no complete vision of life, or solution of its enigmas, in Shakespeare. Humanism is not equal to the task, and is even now becoming a worn-out creed. It is the spirit of the Renaissance, beneficent and needful in its time and place, but not final. A review in *The Listener* (3rd Jan., 1934) quoting the Russian philosopher, Berdyaev, though not written with any reference to Shakespeare, is very applicable here:

> The spirit of the Renaissance is the spirit which makes man the centre of his own world, which would keep man interested in himself and confident in himself, and which denies any concern with a reality higher than humanity. What we are witnessing and experiencing is the destruction of man by himself in consequence of his trust in his own powers. A civilization inspired by the humanism of the Renaissance is inevitably decaying. The War itself and post-war revolutions are ominous signs of the recrudescence of barbarism, and we seem destined to enter upon a renewal of the Dark Ages. The building up of a new civilization will depend on the men of faith. Christianity is going back to the state she enjoyed before Constantine: she has to undertake the conquest of the world afresh. The humanism of the Renaissance will not be able to hold its own against the idolatries which men accept to-day, when they deny or ignore God. . . . We must make real either brotherhood in Christ or comradeship in Antichrist.

These are suggestive words, to my thinking, and they express the limitations of the Shakespearean world-view. There is evidently a sense in which Mr. Shaw's observation is true, one of those sayings of his, thrown out in his challenging and provocative style, which usually contain an element of truth, and at any rate rouse us to profitable reflection. Our delight in Shakespeare's marvellous genius must not blind us to this aspect of his writings, and their marked lack of religious content. We must be grateful for his priceless contribution to our appreciation of the human scene and the capacities and vagaries of human nature, his wonderful psychopathy and his glorious poetry; but he is no sufficient guide to the full development of our spiritual heritage.

His last plays, especially *The Tempest,* present us with yet another problem. How was it that after the storm and stress of his tragic period, the *sæva indignatio,* almost like that which blasted the reason of Dean Swift, against the folly and vileness and ingratitude of men, that marks the great tragedies (especially *Timon* and *Lear*), we find such poise and calm happiness in the later dramas? They are the plays in which Shakespeare exhibits the need of forgiveness in human relationships. How touchingly in the epilogue to *The Tempest* the poet himself prays for forgiveness from his hearers! Some have thought that Shakespeare, in his retirement from his busy London career and assumption of household duties and family joys and cares at Stratford, had realized that his earlier eager activities

had led him in part to neglect the claims of parents and wife and children. He feels the blessedness of forgiving and being forgiven. He has got as far as the Sermon on the Mount. And another lesson he has learnt, as appears from *The Tempest,* is the beauty of service and submission to the common tasks of life. The reader may be referred to the lovely conversations between Ferdinand and Miranda.

What was it that had come to Shakespeare in his peaceful retirement, when he had laid down the great burden of thought and labour that he had borne in London? Can it have been that he had come to know God in Christ, and to understand the meaning and feel the attraction of the Cross? Who can help wishing that he had lived another twenty years, to give us the Christian drama towards which his great mind, with its immense experience of life and unparalleled genius, seemed to be moving, before his untimely death just before reaching the age of 52? Would he not have fully realized that man needs God, and find his ultimate goal and present happiness only in Him? Would he not have turned his attention at last to the grand treasury of human character enshrined in the Bible, and have given us some altogether wonderful rendering of the Life of Lives, the Gospel story, and of the great crusade of love which is the Kingdom of God? Shakespeare is a great deep, almost as unlimited and fathomless as life itself.

> We ask and ask. Thou smilest and art still,
> Out-topping knowledge.

It may be that others, more fully equipped for the task than the writer, may feel moved to treat of the questions here raised.

E. S. Oakley.

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS.

This Section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

THE CRISIS OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY.

It is becoming more and more apparent that Protestantism must work out a Christian theology, a positive articulation of it, in the face of the more modern movements of the day. The *Laymen's Missionary Report* has stirred up discussion. The movements in theological thinking in Europe are likewise significant and instructive. The hard and bitter facts and social desperation of modern life demand that we give a reason for the faith that is in us as one by one we see premisses that we thought axiomatic in our Protestant apologetic shaken and overthrown by the realistic earthquakes and volcanoes of disillusionment. Many have given up genuine religion and have made religions out of an æsthetic love for nature and beauty, or a social passion that articulates itself in the militant programme of Communism or Fascism. Unless Protestantism can develop a programme of thought and action that has about it the note of definiteness, ultimateness, passion, and a militancy that is willing to suffer, there is little hope of its future. No wonder that a prominent theologian has said :

> Protestantism has no word for our times, no power to make real that which she affirms. Therefore she is ignored by the people. Her former sacredness is now shoddy, her salt is no longer salty. She has succumbed to the secular spirit which she feebly attacks, and yet has no power to challenge and triumph over.

Or has she a Word of God, a theology ?

Protestantism is largely responsible for her own plight. She began as a free religion, based upon man's need for moral redemption. The redemption she offered was not based on submission to a creed, nor the meritorious performance of duties, nor emotional and mystic experiences. Her sole authority lay in God, Who was made known in Jesus Christ by the Scriptures through the operation of the Spirit

in the heart of a man of faith. But her subsequent story took her in two different directions, and in consequence she lost her theological bearings. On the one hand, she developed into an orthodoxy that was as materialistic and dogmatic as that of the Roman Church from which she revolted. On the other hand, she became so familiar with science and the currents of contemporary life that she grew into a mere culturalism without any definite salt. That is the end of liberalism —the swamps of sentimental immanence, the absence of any absolute Gospel.

To-day we have these two groups attempting the rehabilitation of theological authority and dynamic. But what hope is there for either?

"Orthodoxy" is hopeless. It is a closed system. As such it cannot make itself respectable to the modern mind. Much as it may deny it, it is a form of rationalism, and not a Christian faith. And because it attempts to be systematic it boxes up God in relative formulas and becomes proud and intolerant by claiming with false dogmatism to have the last word on God. It relies upon intellectual systematizations which can be *defended*, while faith is something that has never lent itself to rational defence. (The uniqueness of Jesus has never formed the conclusion to a defensible syllogism. Always it is a discovery.) Orthodoxy identifies the Word of God with the words of the Bible and entangles itself in Bibliolatry. It tends to substitute sound doctrine for pure faith, a prescribed character or emotional reaction for Reality. Orthodoxy makes of Jesus a freak, since it tends to dissolve His humanity, put Him in a static creed, detract from His ethical power, and increase His theological aloofness. Orthodoxy flirts with absolute idealism, and thus often ignores those facts of life that cannot be reconciled with Christian faith—and faith is not a rationalistic idealism but a supra-rational venture. Orthodoxy attempts circumspectly to put the absolute into relative intellectual moulds. Thus it is guilty of idolatry. It pretends to possess absolute spiritual property in the vessels of relative humanity.

Protestant "liberalism," while it keeps itself fluid and modern, fails as completely as orthodoxy. It has made itself so familiar with science, culture, historical development, and natural human experience that the line between its theology and the various disciplines of modern secularity is so thin as to have practically disappeared. No wonder scientists consider theology dead. It has rationalized itself away! It accepts criticism as a valid method in respect of itself. It seeks to be contemporaneous. It launches out on the changing waters of science. It experiments. It uses modern terms. Good! But in the end it results in mere quest. It never arrives. Its God becomes impersonal and is often identified with natural processes. Its Jesus becomes a mere discoverer of what is latent in man, and those latent facts are called the absolute. It is often too optimistic regarding man's nature. Its concept of the Kingdom is hardly to be distinguished

from that of a man-made Utopia. It takes the sting out of evil: its social theology lacks the realistic note. It inclines to pantheistic monism and thus dissolves the moral dualism between God and man. Though liberals scarcely seem to know it, the end of their method is atheism, agnosticism, cynicism. Their thoughts lead nowhere save to the blind alley of stark negativism where Mr. Bertrand Russell lives. While the theology of liberalism has an undeniable human warmth about it and makes a place for sociology and æstheticism, in the end it is hardly more than a sentimentally illuminated Stoicism.

While there are points of value in liberalism as there are in orthodoxy, in its present status it offers nothing encouraging for the emergence of a positive, militant theology with an objective base. Its greatest fault is that it has not faced realistically the premisses of its optimism; it has not faced the uniqueness of Christ Jesus.

What shall we do in the face of this impasse? We shall have a theology which neither, with orthodoxy, refuses to think, nor, with liberalism, forgets the source of its power. Let us play out our rational capacities to the limit in every phase of theology: life, the Bible, Jesus, God, Church, *etc.* Let us admit that we can have no real satisfying, militant religious experience for a day like this unless we possess it with a clear conscience that we have gone to our rational limits. It is only at the extremity of our own possibilities that we become aware of the living God. Let us admit that theology must be begun from the point of view of our own need as well as from a revelation. Let us admit that the Christian faith is something quite different from philosophic idealism or realism, although these help to give form to theology. Let us eschew the fashion of putting theology into a special compartment of life, thinking of it as a subject for which we must apologize because it is so remote from life. Let us make men feel that theology is still the queen of human interests and that every man is a theologian whether he has studied theology or not—that in the last analysis it is not a question whether a man has a theology or not, but whether he has a *bad* one, a *better* one, or the *best* one! Let criticism have the last word about the real nature of the Bible, about the nature of the early Church, about the historical nature of Jesus. What if our church polities, our Jesus-idols, our magic Book have to go? Will Reality go? Will that in any way impair the Christ of faith, the sacramental nature of the "beloved community," or our inner conviction that the Bible is the Word of God?

A chief difficulty is that so many have a pet theory into which they are not willing to allow the scrutinizing light of science to penetrate. Therein lies the condemnation which men of science have always aimed at dogmatists, whether of the religious or any other type. So long as any man is unwilling to let his faith stand the scrutiny of

inquiry he is a dogmatist and cannot receive the respect of men. The theology of to-day cannot be esoteric.

Why should the modern theologian be afraid of the sneers of erudite and logical philosophers? What is theology anyway? Is it an exact science? Does its validity rest upon logically proved premisses? Is real theology a matter of hard and fast materialistic data? Does it rise and fall with its ability to defend itself by respectable intellectual apologetics? Do we have to defend the Bible? Does Jesus need the props of a frail human and logical Christology? Is He static fact or dynamic power? Are faith and love and hope and God and eternal life statistics? How did Christianity come to be?

After all, theology is not a detailed metaphysic, given by fiat, that stands in the way of a man's use of his rational capacities. It is not a theory of the origin of the universe or even of its composition. Theology is no mechanical transmission of scientific facts, which men might have discovered in time for themselves. Theology is the flash of a vision, the dynamic of an imperative, the promise of a victory. It is a revelation indeed, but no static one. Therefore it does not grow old, though its intellectual clothing does. It has to do not with a man's head, so much as with his heart and will, with the elemental stuff that makes personality. Theology is the science of that "tone" of the eternal which is adumbrated but never possessed. It can be witnessed to, but never completely defended. You cannot call it a finished piece of work although there is something ultimate and once-for-all about it. The philosopher cannot touch it with his logic nor the scientist discredit it with his formulas. It is the queen of all knowledges, for it has to do with all life, even the life of the scientist and the philosopher. In a real sense theology is a given science. It was a gift to man in Jesus. It has therefore a lofty fulcrum that is unconditioned by man's creativity. Theology is *pure* metaphysics: it is known by *faith* and not by *sight* (*i.e.*, logical definition). A man knows real theology if in his desperate search for the real unity of his life he has found God by following the Way of Jesus. Then he really knows truth, not as a spectator—as the philosopher or the theoretical theologian knows it—but as a participant. Then he makes himself the *object* and the Truth of God in Jesus is recognized as the *a priori subject*. Christian theology is God's act.

Is it not time that theology articulated itself in a new boastfulness, claiming its own point of metaphysical departure and its own independence? Why is it necessary to be clinging frantically to the skirts of Einstein and Eddington, Whitehead and Dewey, for fear that our theology will not square with their latest theories? Theology does not despise any method. It does not fear humanism or behaviourism or relativity. It sees in idealism and realism allies. But it bows to

none of them: it claims its own birthright. We know that theology from the human side is not finished, and that our definitions are subject to change, for only the content—the living Christ—is sacred and cannot be humanly controlled.

Once theology comes to such audacity, it will see a day of triumph such as it did not enjoy even in the time of Aquinas or of Calvin. Then it will no longer be the recondite study of a few odd harassed souls; it will be the one subject about which no man will dare be ignorant if he would live socially and individually at his best.

But before that day can come, orthodoxy and liberalism will have to throw aside many of the trappings of traditional and contemporary theology.

The problem that the Christian Church faces everywhere to-day especially in the Protestant tradition, is what to do about Christ, out of Whom the tradition of Christianity streams. Who is He? Does He need the modern support of science, philosophy, and natural theology to maintain His authority? And if Christ alone is sufficient, is His saviourhood eschatological as well as temporal? Unless the Church discovers the vital and dynamic fire of a living theology, which is never generated by logical and theological essays but is only caught from the burning heart of Christ Himself, there can be no thought of her saving her soul—to say nothing of her poor suffering body.

E. G. Homrighausen.

RE-THINKING MISSIONS.

We are spending our summer vacation in China's Holy Land, on the sacred mountain of Tai Shan, where through five thousand years millions of pilgrims have worshipped God. Shrines and temples of all kinds greet us at every turn; pious thoughts in Chinese characters are carved upon the rocks for all to see; along the main ridge, over 5,000 feet above sea level, several large temples occupy the highest points, and a small village shelters people employed in the manufacture of trinkets and pilgrims' necessities. The governor of the province is re-decorating all these temples, and their many images of Buddha are at present in the drying-out stage awaiting their final coats of paint; he is also running a telephone line from the plains to the summit, connecting *en route* his new hotel at the half-way level.

From one of the foot-hills of Tai Shan we overlook the historic city of Tai-an and the plains around it. Within the square walls the ancient Taoist temple spreads its pleasant lawns and shaded courts over an area of a square mile. In the centre of the walled square the Roman Catholic cathedral spire rises from among the mass of grey

mud-tiled roofs of the town dwellings. These dwellings have spread beyond the old walls, and here we notice first the square tower of the Anglican cathedral, and, a little nearer, the American Methodist school buildings and chapel. Tai-an also has its representative of the Four Square Gospellers, who spends most of his time criticizing the activities of the other Missions.

It was a sight that sent our minds back to the English countryside, and yet its very English appearance seemed incongruous. These were not indigenous churches with their past histories rooted in the common peoples of the villages, they were foreign things intruding; they seemed even less a part of the city than did the Peiping-Shanghai express railroad stretching its thin dark line across the fertile plain.

The multiplicity of mission endeavours reminded one of *Re-thinking Missions* and its criticism of the lack of co-operation between different Societies at work in the same field; and its more significant questioning of the value of merely evangelical work among oriental peoples. To what real purpose this perpetual effort at conversion of the heathen to a new faith, and the continuing administering of the sacraments to the converts?

It may be helpful to consider why the classical culture of China is hostile to evangelism, and to think out in what way missionary activity could fulfil the aspirations of classical culture instead of, as at present, trying to destroy some of the most intimate and essential characteristics of it.

Consider first the classical work of Confucius, usually styled *The Doctrine of the Mean*. This phrase was used in the translation for the two characters *chung yung*, whose individual literal meanings are usually given as "middle harmony." The two words were for some curious reason combined together into the word "mean," and the whole work was called a "doctrine" presumably because the translator was a theologian! The word *chung* is the same as that used in the Chinese name for their own country, and there it means "central" rather than "middle," with the suggestion of "central importance" implied. To the modern mind the phrase "The Principle of Inner Harmony" would better convey the ideas back of the original characters.

However, titles apart, here is the translation of what seems to be the most significant passage in the work:

> While there are no stirrings of pleasure, anger, sorrow or joy, the mind may be said to be in a state of equilibrium. When these feelings have been stirred and they act in their due degree, there ensues what may be called the state of harmony. This equilibrium is the great root from which grow all the human actings in the world, and this harmony is the universal path which they all should pursue.

The full wealth of meaning in the original passage must be partly lost in translation, because the translator himself admitted he did not

fully understand it. But even so, if the reader studies the passage with as much reverence as has been bestowed on less significant passages in the Hebrew scriptures, he will find a wealth of meaning and wisdom hidden in it. Taken at its own value it explains the essential characteristics of the Chinese mind; taken in the light of modern psychology it reveals how far in advance of Westerners are the Chinese in the art of living a peaceful life in a world of strife; what we are only just beginning to understand with the help of modern science, they seem to have possessed as an inheritance for many centuries.

Consider next a few short verses from the Confucian *Analects*:

Book II, Chapter XIII.

> The superior man acts before he speaks, and afterwards speaks according to his actions.

Book II, Chapter XIV.

> The superior man is catholic and no partisan, the mean man is a partisan and not catholic.

Book I, Chapter I, Verse 3.

> Is he not a man of complete virtue, who feels no discomposure though men may take no note of him?

Is the Westerner superior enough to be catholic in his reactions towards Chinese thought, and not meanly partisan in favour of his own religious institutions; superior enough to find his joy in service before preaching about it, and virtuous enough to be satisfied with these services even though no one takes any note of his preaching? Can we demonstrate that we actually achieve a surer state of harmony and inner mental equilibrium? Do we come up even to these standards, and if not, how can we pretend to fulfil the aspirations of Chinese culture?

The evangelical Mission, by its very nature, must fail in these points; it is necessarily partisan, and cannot be satisfied unless men do "take note of" its approaches. Even liberal-minded evangelists pity "these Chinese" for their lack of "that something" which we call spiritual joy, and which only conversion can supply. Innumerable comparisons are made between oriental religious ideas and the far superior ideas of Christianity; followers of Confucius have even been referred to as "Confusionists" by one eminent Christian missionary.

Admitted that it is not easy to appreciate the inner thoughts and feelings of "these Chinese," surely a little human sympathy would suffice to reveal how hollow are our claims with regard to "that something": we do not even have a universally accepted phrase to denote it. Do we ever assume that a Westerner has to be a Church member before he can have spiritual joy? Then why do we make the mistake when it comes to a Chinese? The answer is: simply because so many

of us have a race-superiority complex which is the more impossible to eradicate the more we suppress it.

Another important point is this: whereas the average Westerner can tolerate the indecencies of the "Groupers" and regard it as legitimate religious fervour, the reticent Chinese regards even the normal witnessing of the personal evangelist as bordering upon exhibitionism. Evangelical missionaries have never yet had sufficiently intelligent sympathy with this phase of Chinese mentality; what is essentially a mark of culture has been grossly mistaken for indifference or even heathenism. Actually it is we who are crude and coarse, arrogant and at the same time uncivilized. Is it any wonder that our pratings about the way to live carry no weight?

There is hardly need to emphasize here that our Christian teaching is superior to that of the Chinese sages in one particular: the positive joy to be found in a life of loving service, and the redemptive power of love as the spirit of living. The quickness with which the young Chinese student catches this essential of Christian teaching and its social consequences puts to shame the reluctant sluggishness with which the Westerner learns the superior elements in oriental philosophy. Why are we not satisfied that China does get this essential, and why do we expect our theologies to follow along with our ethics?

Consider, for instance, the propagation of Church organizations. These are, theoretically, friendly groupings to foster a way of life; but in practice they seem to be little better than organizations to bolster up certain intellectual creeds. Otherwise why sectarian schisms over credal differences? why, in so many Churches, the demand for credal conformity? why the difficulties about union between Churches holding slightly different shades of doctrine about the sacraments? In spite of all protestations, facts speak loudly enough to convince outsiders that Churches are creed-centred organizations more interested in questions of theology than anything else.

Now the mere existence of popular organizations centred around theological creeds is inconceivable in China; here the theologically minded are the priests; they are isolated in suitably cloistered asylums where they can pursue their parasitic existence without doing too much harm by their exploitation of popular superstitions. The efforts of the Missions to create popular creed-centred organizations, complete with their historical sectarian differences, is ludicrous in the extreme. It can succeed only by completely uprooting the victims from their past and present environment, and transplanting them into a Victorian hot-house. This attempt to spread orthodox Western theologies and creeds can only arise from our conceit, and from our unwillingness to learn from the Orient the relative importance of ethical living and private theories about theological questions. Instead of remaining meanly partisan, let us try to match the Oriental's quick-

ness at learning the good in the others' culture, and try to show in our lives and in our organizations that we really believe the manner of living to be of more importance than doctrines about divinity.

Personally I do not share the anxiety of the "Laymen" who reported in *Re-thinking Missions* that evangelical Missions do a great deal of harm to the poor unthinking converts during their isolation from their inherited environment. Release the convert from the cloisters of the Mission compound, give him a modern scientific education, and he immediately drops the thin veneer of Church partisanship; he becomes himself again with a healthy indifference to theologies; but a whole-hearted acceptance of Christian ethical principles does remain. The Mission has done that much good; the teaching carries its own weight even if we dislike the vehicle through which it was conveyed.

To many, this statement will merely serve to condemn higher education, along with scientific humanism, as of the devil; so to follow up its implications one would have to continue with a general criticism of theology as an intellectual pastime for those with nothing better to do with their brains. We do come here, it seems, to an essential impasse; the bitter pill which the Westerner still refuses to swallow.

We cannot "live and let live" in things intellectual, and we cannot, or will not, admit that another man's ideas are his own and not our business. We are so dominated by herd instincts that we are not satisfied until we are sure that all our neighbours not only do as we do, eat as we eat, dress as we dress, but even think as we think and feel as we feel. This slavery to the herd dominates our religious organizations; it is the cause for all efforts at proselytization, however high-minded our excuses for it may sound to our own ears. Before we can compare with the oriental in his individual freedom and personal development, we simply must break away from this serfdom to the herd in things intellectual.

Probably the present generation never will do so; the gregarious intellect is as much a racial characteristic as the brown colour of the Chinese eye. Perhaps the only hope is for Chinese missionaries to come and teach us the way to freedom. Should we treat such missionaries more receptively than did the Chinese those early missionaries from the west? And should we appreciate Confucius' sermon from Tai Shan as readily as have the Chinese the Sermon on the Mount?

The Christian missionary, by studying the lives and ideas of the people among whom he lives, brings back home a richer experience and a very substantial contribution to human progress; he also generally realizes quite clearly the truth of most of the assertions in *Re-thinking Missions,* and would agree with the positive suggestions

of that book. I have heard ideas expressed among missionaries that they would hardly care to have noised abroad in the orthodox atmosphere at home. The difficulty about "re-thinking missions" cannot be blamed on the missionaries; it is chiefly at home where there is still the same attitude towards the necessity for strictly evangelistic activity, with constantly growing numerical results.

What can a missionary do who has to report home to his Society or Church at regular intervals? Unless he is in a position to stand alone, like a C. F. Andrews or an Albert Schweitzer, he must conform to the herd theologies and the herd demand for converts to those theologies.

Re-thinking Missions has pointed a way of progress towards more effective organization, and a more truly spiritual purpose. It has centred its suggestions around the idea that service to a people in the Spirit of Love is itself the truest evangelism—service that is absolutely disinterested, without thought of conversion as its final consummation: medical service simply because the Chinese people needs medical service; modern education simply because China needs modern education; expert engineering advice given simply because it is needed for the reconstruction of rural China. And none of these things because we wish to convert those to whom we offer the services, but all of them because we love the Chinese people for their own sakes, as a practical demonstration of the Spirit of Jesus.

If we really do love people enough to serve them without ulterior motive, then and only then shall we achieve our full measure of Christianity; and such Christianity is human enough to need no theology to rationalize it, and infectious enough to need no preaching to propagate it.

William Band.

CHURCH OVERDRAFTS.

In recent years many churches, especially those in badly affected industrial areas, have felt the pinch of the depression. This has been reflected seriously in the annual statements of treasurers and has taken the form of a balance on the wrong side of the accounts. In prosperous days "the Church debt" was treated in a jocular fashion, as those responsible were confident of its liquidation by some wealthy member's liberality or from the proceeds of an immediate effort. Nowadays, however, we discuss our balance sheets with grave faces.

Debts pile up in our churches, and officers, after careful scrutiny of expenses and cheeseparing in every direction, are forced, in the face of decreased contributions from poor congregations, to find a solution in borrowing and turn to the bank for help.

In prosperous days banks were often willing to bridge a temporary

gap pending further receipts, but now they are called upon for large amounts over considerable periods, and the problem of security arises. It is rather foolish casuistry which argues that no security ought to be demanded from Christian churches, the individual members of which are quite prepared to secure any overdrafts they may require in everyday life. The banker's prime duty is to his depositors, most of them working people, and to them he is responsible for the safety of their funds. Church membership is in a constant state of flux, and the purpose of demanding cover for loans to religious bodies is to pin down the onus of the debt.

Bankers have shown real sympathy and lenience towards the harassed churches in recent times. There are very many unsecured overdrafts granted on the grounds of sentiment or association by bank officials. On the other hand, from the business point of view, it may pay the bank to allow certain uncovered facilities on the grounds of "connexions." The latter consist mainly of the accounts of the adherents of the borrowing church, who may transfer business elsewhere if the church finances are not supported in times of need. Sometimes a wealthy member of a congregation may dictate terms to a local manager, within limits, on the strength of his bank balance or on an unwritten understanding that he will be personally responsible for the Church debt.

When security is asked for, it usually takes the form of a guarantee. Responsible members of a church may give either " several " guarantees or "joint and several" undertakings. In the former case the guarantor makes himself liable for a fixed portion of the overdraft in the event of default. In the latter, he is responsible for the whole of the amount of the debt if his co-guarantors are unable to meet their shares, and, at the same time, for a portion of the overdraft if his colleagues meet their obligations. The bank, as a rule, requires the signatories to be men of approved standing and checks information given by the parties by enquiries at their own bankers.

Although not ideal security from the banker's point of view, for its realization causes much trouble and not a few heartburnings, the guarantee is the form of cover most widely found in church borrowings from banks. Mortgage of property, usually Church and School buildings, is not looked upon with favour, for ultimate realization in case of need is difficult. Church buildings are often unsuitable for any other than church business and are difficult to dispose of, and, besides, the whole process savours a little of sacrilege. A banker who was instrumental in turning places in which Christians once worshipped into mineral water works or garages would sacrifice his popularity locally and such action would require a lot of living down.

Just as the opening of a church account requires a resolution of the governing body and the appointment of operating officers, so the

application for overdraft requires a minute to that effect, and the banker requires a copy of the resolution, accompanied by the authority of the officials authorized to operate it. This establishes the responsibility of the church for the transactions, but it does not provide assets of a safe nature in the event of default. Hence the guarantee.

A church in the happy position of possessing investments may often avoid selling them, if they are good ones, by depositing them at the bank as cover for a loan, pending better times or receipt of future income. A manse, however, would not be regarded as good security. As a house it might be an ideal mortgage proposition, but the prospect of making a minister homeless to pay off an overdraft does not appeal greatly to bankers. In cases where ministers' houses have been subject to such unhappy occurrences, the bank has taken over the house and allowed either church or pastor to pay a rent rather than call for vacation of premises.

The experience of most church treasurers proves the sympathy of the banks. After all, most bankers are Christians and feel their responsibility keenly. They owe a duty to their depositors and shareholders, but they also show a healthy interest in religious finance. Many of them work accounts of religious bodies free of the usual commission and cut interest charges down to a minimum when borrowing is resorted to, allowing as much as possible on credit balances at the same time.

An interview with a bank manager is always preferable to correspondence. Fellowship can better be established by personal contact, and an hour's conversation is better than a year of letter writing. Church officers should feel no timidity in entering the bank manager's room. The common cause of Christianity is an immediate bond between both parties.

Sometimes the banker has need to be stern with his church clients. His position demands an impartial examination of any proposition, and he must not be expected to show sympathy with extravagance. We are too often liberal and exuberant in our finances and expect to borrow merrily to help us in our schemes. A gentle reproof will often put the brake on our spending of our congregation's money and act as a salutary reminder that we must tighten our belts and help ourselves a little too.

A Banker.

A CONSTRUCTIVE COMRADESHIP.

In 1919, the second year of my ministry in Darwen, I invited a number of young men to meet me and talk over the possibility of forming a Discussion Class, Study Circle, or something which would

bring us together once a week for mutual edification. I had no elaborate plans to put before them. It was purely a desire to keep in touch with them, in order to know them better and ascertain their outlook on life. The response was gratifying. I found they were eager to come together and willing to be led.

It was a small beginning; we did not advertise it or give a general invitation to all the young men in the church to join. At first there were only seven or eight. Knowing nothing of their intellectual calibre, I suggested starting in a tentative way with a simple book, which might open up important aspects of life and give us a basis for discussion. Eventually J. Cameron Lees's *Life and Conduct,* a book of a former generation, but one which had stood the test, was chosen. It proved very interesting and helpful. At first diffidence in expressing themselves was marked. The whole thing was new and strange, but the constant repetition of the point that it was to be an atmosphere of freedom and friendliness gradually melted the diffidence and shyness.

By degrees the numbers grew. Others were attracted, and for a considerable time fourteen to sixteen used to attend regularly. None of us expected a crowd. We knew that such a group, devoting itself to the study of a book and anything relevant that arose out of its contents, would not appeal to everyone. But winter after winter for thirteen years the Class was kept going. We always studied a book, although the discussion was not always confined to the book itself. From the simple beginning with *Life and Conduct* we passed on to Dr. R. E. Welsh's *In Relief of Doubt.* This book, which also had proved its worth long before it was introduced to the Class, made a strong appeal, and we had great times in discussing the questions it raised. In the intervening years I have often heard members testify how stimulating it was and how it met their difficulties. The hours spent with *In Relief of Doubt* were pleasant and fruitful. The recent reprint of this book was of great interest to us and confirmed the high opinion we formed of it.

One thing it did—it paved the way for another book—George Robson's *The Way to Personality.* This was a severer test and for some time the members found it hard. It must be remembered that they had had no systematic instruction in Christian truths. They were working lads, engaged in various callings and pursuits. But they stuck to it with commendable tenacity and courage. It was obvious by now that their powers of self-expression and of criticism were awakening and growing. Robson's challenge rang out on almost every page and his interpretation of the essence of Christianity was so fresh and clear. While they could not always follow him, the lads freely confessed their indebtedness to him and admitted that he was a stimulating writer. One admirable purpose the book served:

it presented to them the Christian view in modern terms. As the years went on we took other books, including *The Laws of Life,* by Dr. Mellone; the "Copec" report on "Leisure"; *The Control of the Mind,* by Dr. Thouless; *Everyman and Christianity,* by Dr. Waterhouse. Some of these gripped more than others. *The Laws of Life,* which the leader considered a most suitable introduction to Ethics, fell rather flat. Perhaps one reason was that it was taken after the Class had reached something like maturity and that it did not contain quite enough to meet their mental appetite.

In my judgment Waterhouse's *Everyman and Christianity* was a fine little book, giving just the help young fellows needed to understand Christianity, but it did not impress as I expected. Still we went through it chapter by chapter. *The Control of the Mind,* owing perhaps to the present day interest in Psychology, won its way from the outset and caused many a hot discussion. It dealt with practical issues, and brought home to each member the immense importance of the subject.

As stated, the Class continued for thirteen years, a sufficiently long time to gauge its effect.

(1) It was a piece of intensive work, spade work quietly done without fuss or ostentation. It was questionable whether many people in our church knew much about it. They simply heard the announcement on Sundays that the Young Men's Class would meet on Monday evenings. Yet it was an experience for which I have not ceased to feel profoundly thankful. To meet a number of young fellows every week and to come to grips with things that matter was delightfully refreshing. It was purposive and constructive comradeship.

(2) The fellowship of the Class was all that could be desired. In getting down to things we got to know one another. All came to realize that they could express themselves without let or hindrance and they were not slow to avail themselves of the privilege. Now and again the most outrageous views were expressed! It was a whirlwind of heterodoxy! But good humour and good fellowship kept acrimony out of every discussion. If all the views ventilated on politics, economics, social questions, betting and gambling, the Church, religion, business, *etc.* could be recalled and tabulated they would make strange reading. And yet they might reveal youth's thoughts of the modern world.

One big advantage was that they came to know me not as the man in the pulpit but as a man among men and one of themselves. There was never a semblance of lack of respect for or lack of confidence in their leader.

(3) All through the years one main purpose was stressed—to give them a point of view which would enable them to work out their own

salvation. It was not to do their thinking for them but to help them to think for themselves, with the vital proviso "under the guidance of the spirit of Christ."

(4) Another impression left on my mind was the eagerness of many young people to learn and know. "The thoughtlessness of youth" is often an unjust and undeserved phrase. Such a generalization may err seriously in judgment. I found these young men, with one or two of middle-age thrown in, anxious to test the foundations and willing to be instructed. The continuance of this Class for thirteen years proves that much can be done with young men in stimulating their minds, guiding their aspirations, and grounding them in the deep soil of Christian principles.

(5) To aid us in our work we formed a small library, for which books were carefully selected. True, they could all be put in a box, specially made by one of the members. Every member could take out a book as often as he wished on condition that he returned the one he had. This was sometimes forgotten. Some books belong to the Dispersion even yet! A small levy on each member enabled us to make new purchases from time to time.

(6) Early in each autumn we had a ramble in the Ribble Valley. It always included a good walk for so many miles, tea at a Guest House or Farm House, a game of football—and other items.

What has become of the Class? The majority are married and settled down in life and owing to other claims they find it difficult to attend every week. But it is noteworthy that they did not wish the fellowship to be broken up. So it has been converted into "The Old Boys' Circle" which meets monthly. Last winter we took Weatherhead's *How can I find God?*, with good results. The Circle is available when any special work has to be done.

In the course of the years about fifty have passed through the Class. There was a constant coming and going, but there was always a faithful remnant of a dozen or more.

It is a pleasure to record the fact that several members hold official positions in the Church. One is a deacon, two others are Joint Superintendents in the Sunday School, while others are officers and teachers. And there is much other fruit which we cannot see or measure.[1]

J. Emrys Morgan.

FOR, BUT ALSO BY, THE YOUNG.

Of late years churches have tried hard to cater for youth. Scores of buildings have been altered and equipped for sport and recreation.

[1] A second article by Mr. Emrys Morgan, describing an experiment with boys, will appear in our next issue.—Editor.

Schools have been cleared of their antiquated forms and the floors marked out for badminton. The largest ante-rooms have become institutes, with billiard tables and furniture for smaller table games. To-day the best property belonging to many churches is occupied solely by young people for purposes of recreation.

Most churches, too, have their recreation grounds for tennis, cricket, and football. People who are specially interested in the welfare of youth do not hesitate to spend both time and money in organizing rambles, field days, camps, and excursions to distant places.

In this class of work churches often find themselves in unhealthy competition with each other for the favour and attendance of the young people. A worn cover on a billiard table, if not watched and soon replaced by a new one, will cause a drift to another institute where conditions of play are more perfect. Others interested in cricket or football will not hesitate to make a change if the field or general arrangements are better in another club. Good badminton players desire the hall which can provide the best courts, and many do not hesitate to change their "faith" accordingly.

For hikers and cyclists the minister, with the caretaker and a few devoted people, rise early on the Sabbath morning and provide a service, so that these young people can attend church before their Sabbath day's journey, which in these modern years is marked by its distance, not its brevity.

Both pulpit and pew have been subjected to embarrassing influences from this intense anxiety to please the young. The minister has to be "O.K.," "sporty" and young. Ministers of fifty years of age are considered by some churches to be too old to enter upon a pastorate. The message from the pulpit must be topical, terse, and tender, for the preacher must at all cost remain popular. The small company of older worshippers feels that their church life lacks something vital, but they quietly attend and hope for the best. Youth must be considered.

We would not for a moment speak lightly of the many efforts made to attract and attach youth to the churches. In all these movements real sacrifice has been made and service given most ungrudgingly. Nor is it seemly to tilt at the young people who have enjoyed the fun at the church's expense. But the day has come when youth must rally to the work entailed by the church's mission. Unless this takes place now churches will be closing down as so many find themselves without reliable folk to carry on.

On the pleasurable and recreational side the churches cannot do more for the young. Often they have burdened themselves spiritually and financially with projects which have done little for the real welfare of those committed to their charge. Now that numbers and resources are so limited it is impossible, even if it were desirable, for

further developments along these lines. Moreover, if the ministry is to be maintained in many churches, considerable economies and much re-organization are essential.

The sheer necessity of the hour forces the conviction that a new enterprise for youth must be undertaken. While the Church in the past has catered for youth in so many respects, it has failed to provide it with a mission. The invitation to attend some feeble, dying meeting will never be answered by a virile youth seeking venture and romance. Until the Church can offer youth a job big enough to demand youth's full gifts and energies, young people will not think first about the Church. The quick, keen eye of youth so often penetrates beyond the narrow visions of the Church.

Though at times the demands of youth seem strange, they are mostly quite legitimate. The mistake so often lies in the effort made to meet them. In those demands are embodied very largely the ideals to which young life should be consecrated. It is in this way that posterity prepares itself for the future.

If the Church is ever rescued from the disaster threatening her on every hand, it will be by an enterprise which has enlisted youth into its service. The fidelity of senior people, though always the abiding strength of church life, does not in itself provide the energy which makes a church progressive. New territory is not gained by garrison duty, however faithfully it may be done. To-day the church is almost entirely on the defensive, and largely so because no youthful life carries the warfare into the enemy's country. But a siege can last only so long.

But can youth be so enlisted?

In the first place churches should, once and for all, give up the idea that young people must be given special work, or that they need special organizations with special treatment. Coddling never did, and never will, appeal to the finest type of young manhood and womanhood. Young people often laugh at the foolish schemes on which the Church spends so much of her energy.

Thoughtful young people, more than ever before, are out to face stern realities. They are prepared to tackle the big problems of Christian living, and they want to know first of all whether the Church is perfecty sure that she herself is fully prepared to become Christian in thought, word, and deed. Youth does not ask for an easy complacency: it seeks an affinity with clean venturesome righteousness.

Youth must always be in action. Therefore there should be no hesitation in placing youth in executive positions. Young men should be on every diaconate. And not simply in sparse numbers so that their ideas can be easily squashed in voting, but in a representative capacity which ensures sympathetic hearing.

It should be the deliberate aim of churches to place responsibility in the hands of her young followers. They will not betray confidence,

for they are not sufficiently moulded by the ways of the world. Moreover, any task accepted by them will be carried through with a fervour and fidelity that will be both inspiring and contagious.

Youth, too, must express itself. Its thinking may not always be profound, but its desires for truth are generally very sincere. Frequently on Sunday evenings the pulpit should be open for youth to voice its opinions and bear its witness. The fellowship of the Church loses much by listening always to carefully prepared utterances the conclusions of which have been known and accepted for half a century.

Youth must always attach itself to someone or something. It hates isolation and refuses to tread a lonely path. The Christian crusade has not lost its glamour for youth. It never will. But there is a very real danger of much of our most promising youth attaching itself to Christian causes at present outside the Church's narrow realm. The situation is critical, and the Church needs to enlarge her policy and outlook and make a daring appeal to youth to further her divine cause.

Christ was a young man. He founded the Church in the strength of His youth and gave His finest manhood for her life, and later died for her salvation. Many young people want to follow Him. Only by them can the Church be saved for future generations.

A. Graham Eldridge.

THE CHILDREN'S SERMON.

Many a minister who does brilliant work while addressing his ordinary congregation finds his heart turn to water when the demands of his people make him face the preparation of sermons for the children. His training has all been towards the abstract, and his practice has been obtained in addressing intelligent grown-ups. The psychology he studied at college has been of the good old-fashioned kind that had for its subject the mature middle-aged man such as he now himself is, and the genetic kind that deals with growth and development had not yet reached the psychological classroom. This type of minister still regards the boy as merely a little man, and blunders accordingly.

Elizabeth Akers Allen has a metrical prayer:

> Backward, turn backward, O Time in your flight.
> Make me a child again, just for to-night.

Our puzzled preacher is inclined to join in this petition, and would be willing to buy with a great price a favourable answer. To be sure he realizes that the prayer is futile as it stands, yet the spirit of it remains with him, and he turns round in search of a more practicable way of attaining the end he has in view. On one occasion T. H. Huxley, when lecturing on the crayfish, was asked by one of his students whether that creature, with its eyes on stalks, sees the world as we see it. His answer was that the only way to know how a crayfish sees is to be a crayfish. But our puzzled

preacher is not in the same distressful position as that enquiring student. For, after all, mature ministers were once children, and have the chance of recalling how they once felt and saw. It is true that a great many people do not care to take the trouble to recall their juvenile experiences. Even professional school-teachers seem to neglect this means of discovering what their pupils think; otherwise there would have been no need for the clever book that Mr. Floyd Dell wrote for them under the title: *Were You Ever a Child?* The teacher gains something even by the simple experience of sitting down in a spare half-hour and letting his mind wander about in stark reverie. No guidance is needed beyond keeping the mental meanderings to the age-period that we wish to recall. One idea suggests another in such a way that at the end of the half-hour a vast number of ideas that had been long buried deep in the unconsciousness have been brought back to the mind.

But the minister need not depend merely upon the chance workings of the mind in reverie. He can take a definite share in the process of recall. He may pass from reverie to reminiscence. He may deliberately aid the mind in its process of re-living the past. He may set the scene on which the memory is to disport itself. He may direct his attention to the circumstances of the time of his life that he wishes to revive. He may be able to re-visit the actual place where he spent the time. Fortunate indeed is the man who can go back to the old family home where in various obscure places on the wall he can find pencil-marks with a note of the age he was when he was measured against that wall at recorded date. With a house of that kind at his disposal the enquirer is in a capital position for making the past give up its treasures. He may really make his boyhood live again.

But apart from this complete reconstruction there is a good deal of partial re-building of the past that gives useful insights into its activities. Any one of the objects that formed a part of our surroundings at the age we wish to recall is a valuable instrument in the reconstruction process. Any object whatever is of use, and the inquirer is often surprised how many unexpected experiences are recalled by some trifling item—an old top, a broken cricket bat, a ragged butterfly net, a dilapidated fishing-rod. But perhaps the most useful, and certainly the most accessible, material is provided by old books. If one can re-read the books he read at a given age, he is very likely to recall how he thought and felt at that time. The chance of successful recall is much increased if the investigator is fortunate enough to have at his disposal the very copy that he read at the period under examination.

As the past evolves itself while the investigator reads the old familiar book, he usually has a surprising impression that what he recalls is much more advanced than he expected. In other words the thoughts that he recalls are much more mature than he thought he was capable of at that distant date. This probably arises from a certain hardly avoidable illusion. Whether we will or no, we are all apt to read into the past impressions that have been made in the period that has intervened between the past experience and its present recall. But this illusion is not a bad thing: its effect is wholesome. For it tends to counteract another illusion that has a tendency to mislead us in our estimation of the possibilities of youngsters. We are all inclined to underestimate rather than overestimate the powers of children. Sir Walter Scott was certainly right in his view that most of us take too low a view of what youngsters can understand and appreciate. This tendency comes out rather markedly in the children's sermons that come from the pulpits filled by young ministers. These young men would do well to take an odd half-hour for the consideration of the difference between *childish* and *child-like*. The *-ish* conveys an atmosphere of con-

tempt. The word is sinister. On the other hand, the *-like* carries the notion of approval. Too often the children's sermon carries the *-ish* atmosphere.

"Talking down" to the children is a favourite phrase of criticism that indicates that the profession is aware of the dangers involved in underestimating the powers of the young audience. Too often the danger is met in an unsatisfactory way by the preacher's concentration on the language to be used. "Big words" are certainly to be avoided in addressing children, but the size of the words is not the only thing to be considered. An English bishop once wrote a life of King Alfred in words of one syllable. (He was chagrined afterwards to find that in his 4,000 words he had slipped in the disyllable *even*.) The total result was far from satisfactory in the matter of easy comprehension. The truth is that it is a matter of directness of construction rather than size of words. Experience shows that the inclusion of a few words that the children do not understand is not of vital importance. They may be able to carry off the full meaning of the sermon though there may be several gaps brought about by unknown words. Educators are now realizing that in the process of learning it is essential to introduce all along the line words that are not known to the pupils. In no other way can the pupils acquire in a natural way an addition to their vocabulary. The time is past when words were taught as separate units, when the pupils were set to learn lists of words called gardens of words, forests of words, treasure-houses of words. They are taught words now by using them, and by finding out their meaning by the contexts in which they are found. It is not to be supposed that all this attacks in any way the systematic study of words. There is nothing more important in the process of school teaching than this study. All that is implied is that from the preacher's point of view an occasional big word is no heinous offence. The very effort to minimize the size of the words used causes an unwholesome attitude of mind. We must not concentrate our attention on the words. Take care of the sense, and the words will take care of themselves.

Educators lay down a very sensible principle with regard to the order in which things should be presented to pupils of all kinds, a principle that is as applicable to the sermon as to the school lesson. *Proceed from the concrete to the abstract.* Truth to tell, this is a principle that cannot be neglected. The teacher and preacher "can none other." We simply cannot reverse the process, even if we try. No doubt in the past many teachers thought they were teaching from the abstract to the concrete, by laying down rules and then supplying examples. They assumed that the pupils learnt the rule, which of course was more or less abstract, and then proceeded to the example which was concrete. Yet what really happened was that the child did not understand the rule at all, but went straight on to the example which was more within his range, and by dealing with the examples (and the more of them given the better the chance of the pupil's success) finally worked his way back to the truth of the rule, which the teachers foolishly assumed that he knew from the beginning. The old way of teaching Grammar was largely carried on in this fashion.

One value of this urging upon the notice of the preacher a rule that he cannot break is the attention it centres on the relative importance of the concrete and the abstract. Accordingly, when the minister begins to deal with the children's sermon, he must remind himself that in facing a juvenile audience he has to place the concrete in a more commanding position than when he is addressing the more mature members of his congregation. No harm will be done if consideration of what is said here induces the preacher

to elevate the position of the concrete even in the preparation of the ordinary sermon for adults. Indeed, if this happens there will be a benefit to all concerned.

But at this stage a warning is not uncalled for. Preachers of a somewhat dramatic temperament are tempted to go a little too far to meet the concrete. There is no harm in introducing occasionally into the pulpit certain material objects that may be used symbolically—a lily, a flag, a soldier's helmet, a three-hundred-year-old Bible. But it is easy to overdo this attraction, and to cultivate a craving for three-dimensioned teaching material. Practical professional teachers are probably right when they condemn this form of teaching as "vaudeville stunts." A good deal depends on the temperament of the preacher. Some can carry off a good deal of flag-wagging and symbolizing without lowering the intellectual and religious level of their teaching. But others are in great danger of loss of dignity from lack of sympathy with this type of presentation. The type of preacher that we had in view at the beginning of this article will probably be well advised to avoid the dramatic.

On the other hand, the diffident preacher need not worry greatly because he has no vaudeville gifts. After all the youngsters are fundamentally human beings, and genetic psychology does not warn off the good preacher-to-adults. The laws of human nature hold for both parents and children, though allowance must be made for the different stages through which humanity passes on its way to maturity.

JOHN ADAMS.

ON LIFE AND BOOKS.

THE WHOLE—AND NOTHING BUT!

War Memoirs. By DAVID LLOYD GEORGE. 4 volumes. Nicholson & Watson. 21s. each.

An Autobiography. By VISCOUNT SNOWDEN. 2 volumes. Nicholson & Watson. 21s. each.

Journals and Letters of Reginald, Viscount Esher. Edited by MAURICE V. BRETT. 2 volumes. Nicholson & Watson. 25s. each.

To tell the truth is by no means as easy as the moralists sometimes suggest. To find the truth seems to be harder still. Everybody who has tried to write a biography, or even an obituary notice, is aware of the difficulties. If the subject be Elizabeth or Cromwell, one is always painfully conscious of the little one really knows about the Queen or the Protector, while to read a *Life* of a person one has known invariably proves how rarely the whole truth is told. Not long ago the *Life* of a distinguished divine appeared. Everybody who knew him intimately knew that the key to his actions for a decade was to be found in his domestic circumstances, a fact of which no mention was made in the biography. A letter from Lord Esher to John Morley about the editing of Queen Victoria's letters touches on one point of the problem.

> It has been a difficult task, not only because of the mass of material, but because the book is to be published by the authority of the King, and both as Sovereign and Son, his interests must be carefully guarded. I know that my confrère thinks that I have expunged too freely, but it is better to be on the safe side. Palmerston, who was, as you know, such a *bête noire* to both the Queen and the Prince, has been a great difficulty. Then, the sons of all the people are alive, and an unkind reflection on the part of a colleague does not matter much, but coming from Queen Victoria, it leaves a sting, and there seems to be no sense in giving unnecessary pain. You will realize the difficulty and the responsibility.

And when it comes to autobiography! Despite the frankness of one or two recent autobiographies along one line, how rarely does the writer tell the whole truth—and nothing but? To forget youthful *gaucheries* and adult blunders, to magnify successes, to rationalize actions and find excuses for errors of judgment—who can escape these things? To remember how important were boyish love-affairs, exclusion from a football team, or an examination, not to carry to-day's estimates back to the years of long ago, and always to keep the right perspective, these things are almost beyond the reach of mortals.

Least of all should we expect a politician to succeed in the art of autobiography. His past is public, his deeds naked and laid open. Almost in spite of himself his story resolves itself into a defence, almost inevitably he reads back into the past the knowledge he possesses in the present, and lets the events of the intervening years colour his narrative.

Mr. Lloyd George's *War Memoirs* is a notable case in point. We can forgive the old cricketer whose playing days are over for recounting his triumphs and seeing them in a rosy light, but what are we to do when he claims that all the fast bowlers against him used leg theory and were at least twice as fast as Larwood, and that all the umpires' decisions

against him were wrong, indeed that all the umpires were incompetent—and probably corrupt?

In some ways Mr. Lloyd George's *Memoirs* are far better than might have been expected. They are readable—*that* we did expect. They are, though not well arranged, well documented, and not only for the War period: there are two letters from Lord Willingdon, written when Governor of Bombay in 1916, pleading for generous treatment of India, which have their significance to-day. They are informing, and not merely about peace moves and political intrigues, but as showing the reactions of statesmen to each other and to new situations—witness a striking picture of Balfour meeting artisans on an equal footing for the first time.

In general, however, these volumes are a defence; they are a mammoth pamphlet and not history. If Mr. Lloyd George dreamed of wearing the mantle of Gibbon, he will no doubt learn that while he considers himself to have related *The Rise of David Lloyd George,* his readers will only be too conscious of the calamitous fall which followed. Indeed, as one reads, one cannot but feel that there is at work in Mr. Lloyd George an exaggerated inferiority complex. Anyone with a better education or upbringing than himself "gets it in the neck" sooner or later; there are bitter attacks on everybody who has opposed him, and innumerable onslaughts on men who have served their country well. The megalomania underlying the book—with its "My decision to set up an Inter-Allied staff" and the like—is all the more regrettable when we remember Mr. Lloyd George's great achievements. Had he been content to tell the story, and let that be his advocate, to relate what was done in the Ministry of Munitions and in the organizing of the Food Supply, it would have been infinitely better for his reputation and for historians! As it is, the *War Memoirs* only serve to convince the reader that the last word was said by Asquith—and here is no doubt the head and front of his offending—on 25th November, 1916:

> As to Mr. Lloyd George . . . He has many qualities that would fit him for the first place, but he lacks the one thing needful—he does not inspire trust.

Now if anyone expresses an opinion like that about Mr. Lloyd George, he will sooner or later have to pay for it. Haig will have to be put in his place, alive or dead, for has he not written to Gough thus:

> Asquith has been most unjustly and unfairly blamed for the conduct of the war. . . I can tell you, my dear Hubert, that as Commander-in-Chief, there is no question as to which was the better Prime Minister to serve under. . . In Asquith I always had a loyal supporter, and there was no suggestion which I made for the benefit of the Army or for the more efficient conduct of the war operations that he did not do his best to carry out. . . The efforts of Asquith were always directed to the support of Britain and the British Army. He was proud of the Empire and he trusted Britain and British soldiers.

To substantiate this statement about Mr. Lloyd George's references to his colleagues it is only necessary to give a few extracts:
Sir John Simon:

> Sir John Simon's feeble efforts to lead a "cave" on conscription were a ridiculous failure. He is a very able man, but he commands neither the boldness, the breadth, nor the inspiration that are essential to great leadership.

Lord Grey :

temperamentally fractious . . . Even when he was busily negotiating faction inside his Party he preferred to remain behind the lines, leaving the actual fighting to Lord Rosebery . . . not made for prompt action. . . . He altogether lacked that quality of audacity which makes a great Minister. . . . . belongs to the class which, through heredity and tradition, expects to find a place on the magisterial bench to sit in judgment upon and above their fellowmen, before they ever have any opportunity to make themselves acquainted with the tasks and trials of mankind—and some of them preserve those magisterial airs through life. They are remote from the hard work of the community. They take it for granted. . . .

He lacked the knowledge of foreign countries and the vision, imagination, breadth of mind and that high courage, bordering on audacity, which his immense task demanded. . . . His tiresome hesitancies helped us into the War, but they hindered us when we were well in it. . . His aloofness was monumental. . . Ever non-committal and hesitating. . . He was quite futile in any enterprise that demanded decision and energy, and the tremendous responsibility of action in war had a paralytic effect on his powers. I cannot think of any suggestion of his that contributed in the least to the effective prosecution of the War. . . .

I have no recollection that Sir Edward Grey, to whom these communications were addressed, took any steps to bring this important message to the notice of the British Cabinet. He took refuge in that aloofness that detached him from all concern for the efficient conduct of a war he had advised the Government to declare.

Mr. Runciman :

Although he is a man of high intelligence, there is a lack of continuity and persistent application which has always accounted for his failure to achieve any distinguished success in any of the various offices which he has held. He never follows through. The energy and mastery which he succeeds in conveying in his speeches evaporate before they are translated into masterful action. His most conspicious attribute is a glib inefficacy, which can explain and expound with forcible and relevant fluency what he is after and why he has never got it. He has a perfect command of the whole jargon of business, and he flips it about in his speeches with a dexterity which awes the ignorant and impresses even the proficient. There he excels and there he also ends.

Mr. McKenna :

possessed many of the gifts that make a good administrator in times that do not call specially for imagination, breadth of vision, or human insight. He knew the details of his job as Chancellor, he was a competent arithmetician, a ready reckoner (Mr. Balfour once said he was "an adroit accountant"), he was, in fact, a master of finance in blinkers. His chief defect, as I have already pointed out, was that he was apt to divide his more conspicuous colleagues into those he liked and those he viewed with distrust, suspicion, and jealousy. This peculiarity made him a source of weakness and distraction in a team. . . . His was the most active personal element in the disintegration of the Asquith Coalition. A lady with a gift of satirical analysis of character once said to me that he was like one of those shilling paint-boxes given to children. The blocks were hard and angular, the

colours were all very definite and crude. He possessed none of those delicate tints which you find on an artist's palette.

Mr. John Buchan :

> Three fundamental inaccuracies in a single sentence are not a bad achievement even for a writer who has won fame by inventing his facts. The real explanation is that Mr. Buchan found it so much less trouble to repeat War Office gossip than to read War Office documents.

Mr. Neville Chamberlain has "a vein of self-sufficient obstinacy." . . . Of Asquith we have not only the usual complaints of lack of energy and decision, but digs like

> . . . Mr. Asquith, after a short perfunctory conversation, retired to his usual rest before dinner. . . .

In praising Bonar Law, with whom Mr. Lloyd George says he got on well because both were of lowly origin, he takes the opportunity to say of Asquith :

> Although Mr. Asquith had come from similar stock and the like environment, he strove consistently to quit his early past and to surround himself with the appearance of being a native of another world, to which he really never belonged by origin, disposition or pursuits, and to conform as best he could to these new surroundings. Bonar Law would have disdained such contortions to adjust himself to social conditions he detested and despised.
>
> I recollect Lord Morley telling me that a prominent Jew once said to him that he had striven all his life "to get out of the Ghetto, but had utterly failed to do so!" Mr. Asquith strained painfully and patently to get out of "Bethel"; but although he managed to leave it far behind, he was a stranger and a sojourner in any other home. He was ill at ease with either of Disraeli's Two Nations. He shunned direct contact with the people, neither had he the traditions nor the lure of aristocracy.

If colleagues come off badly, soldiers come off even worse. Civilian opinion on War policy is sure to be right, military opinion wrong. The War Office, the General Staff, the Generals are obstinate, stupid, conservative, wedded to their plans, inflexible. Here again, Mr. Lloyd George would have done well to let the facts speak for themselves. There is much to be said for the "Eastern" conception of strategy, but the shrieking repetition of Mr. Lloyd George's Volume IV, in which he tears himself to tatters in denouncing military incompetence and blindness, damages his own case. It is one thing to speak of

> the fantastic obsession which dominated the War Office and Headquarters in France, that the best place to attack the enemy was at his strongest point;

but Mr. Lloyd George goes much further :

> In Palestine and Mesopotamia nothing and nobody could have saved the Turk from complete collapse in 1915 and 1916 except our General Staff. The real citadel of the Ottoman Empire was neither at Achi Baba, Baghdad nor Jerusalem—but in Whitehall. For three years this redoubtable garrison of the effete beat off every attack made on the attenuated armies of the Turk. The War Office saved Gallipoli from falling : for two years it protected the feeble garrison of Palestine from meeting its doom. It did what it could to avert the capture of Baghdad. . .

> The tale of these battles constitutes a trilogy illustrating the unquenchable heroism that will never accept defeat and the inexhaustible vanity that will never admit a mistake. It is the story of the million who would rather die than own themselves cowards—even to themselves—and also of the two or three individuals who would rather the million perish than that they as leaders should own—even to themselves—that they were blunderers. Hence the immortal renown and the ghastly notoriety of the Verdun, Somme and Passchendaele battlefields; the fame won by sustained valour unrivalled in the annals of war; the notoriety attained by a narrow and stubborn egotism, unsurpassed amongst the records of disaster wrought by human complacency.

Not only were Haig, Robertson, and the rest prepared to adhere to their stupid plans at any cost—to others, but they deliberately deceived the War Cabinet to secure their ends, even going so far as to remove able-bodied prisoners from cages Mr. Lloyd George was to examine when visiting G.H.Q. Here are the accusations:

> If the whole truth as it was known at the time, to the military staffs, had been exposed before the members of the War Committee, the Flanders offensive would have been turned down.
>
> As it was, we had to judge upon a basis of essential facts suppressed, distorted and misrepresented. . . the public at home, official and unofficial, were all dosed day by day with tendentious statements about victories won, and progress made towards more assured and even greater triumphs. . . The reports passed on to the Ministers were, as we all realized when it was too late, grossly misleading. Victories were much overstated. Virtual defeats were represented as victories however limited their scope. Our casualties were understated. Enemy losses became pyramidal.

Perhaps the last word about Haig should be Mr. Lloyd George's, not in memoirs written long after the time, and after Haig's death, but when Passchendaele had been raging ten weeks:

> The following is issued for publication, from the Prime Minister to Sir Douglas Haig, Commander-in-Chief, General Headquarters, France.
>
> October 16th, 1917.
>
> The War Cabinet desires to congratulate you and the troops under your command upon the achievements of the British Armies in Flanders in the great battle which has been raging since July 31st.
>
> Starting from positions in which every advantage rested with the enemy, and hampered and delayed from time to time by most unfavourable weather, you and your men have, nevertheless, continuously driven the enemy back with such skill, courage, and pertinacity, as have commanded the admiration of the Peoples of the British Empire and filled the enemy with alarm.
>
> I am personally glad to be the means of transmitting this message to you, and to your gallant troops, and desire to take the opportunity of renewing my assurance of confidence in your leadership, and in the devotion of those whom you command.
>
> D. Lloyd George.

The sailors received from Mr. Lloyd George the same shrift as the soldiers. Here is a sneer at Jellicoe:

> Meanwhile, the flagship must be interned in safe creeks, the flag had to be carried on the small craft, the nimble destroyers and the weather-beaten trawlers. Here is the "Nelson touch" up-to-date.

Indeed, there are few in the *Memoirs* who receive unqualified praise. Mr. Henderson is called "the greatest political organizer of his day," Sir John Cowans is an exceptional soldier, and the "business men" appointed to responsible posts by Lloyd George are all paragons. In general, however, there is only one person right during these critical years, Mr. Lloyd George himself. Perhaps the most amazing and amusing sentence of all is when he accuses President Wilson of failure of memory (at least)—and goes on :

> A lapse of memory was therefore pardonable. As it affects the relations between two great countries I feel bound to correct the mistake. Good faith is essential to good understanding between nations as well as individuals.

Lord Snowden has also some scathing things to say about those associated with him—but he has not waited until they are dead to say it; indeed his most moving passages are those relating to comrades of his like W. C. Anderson and Willie Graham, whose loss to the Labour Party is as apparent to those outside as to those within it. Nevertheless, his autobiography, too, leaves the impression that Philip Snowden is well content with himself in a world peopled by inferior intellects, most of whom deserve a pitying contempt—and this effect is heightened by the number of laudatory press notices quoted. Here Lord Snowden is less than just to himself, for his career needs no bush. Especially is he severe on some of his old colleagues : Mr. MacDonald's words are more than once quoted as if they were serious when obviously they were pleasantries, and opinions expressed in private conversations and deliberations revealed to the world. Of Mr. MacDonald's speech in the House of Commons on the Campbell case, he writes :

> This incoherent, evasive and prevaricating reply staggered the House, and made his colleagues . . . hang their heads in shame.

[Asquith is quoted about this incident as saying he had never known a case where a Government had so wantonly and unnecessarily committed suicide]. Lord Snowden pays a fine tribute to Mr. Montagu Norman and writes with obvious affection of Mr. Baldwin. His first volume has more of the nature of true autobiography than the second, though we are perhaps prejudiced in its favour by its opening words, "I am a Yorkshireman." Indeed, this volume is so good that it is a pity that it is not better. The writer anticipates criticism of the style of the book, and is conscious of defects in arrangement, and so we say nothing on that score; there are, however, a good many slips and roughnesses which might have been avoided with a little more care and revision. John Bunyan and George Whitfield (*sic*) were scarcely contemporaries, the Liberal newspaper proprietor's name was Starmer, not Stamer, the Liberal candidate in Keighley in 1918 was not a Quaker but a Congregationalist, Earl Russell's name is Bertrand, and *sprits* is unfortunate for *spirits* on p. 181. Especially valuable and true to life is the account of the writer's youth, with its vivid pictures of education and religion in a West Riding village, pictures reminiscent of the youth of Joseph Wright, with whom Lord Snowden is not unworthy to be compared. With dogged persistence and with great courage, and despite many handicaps, Philip Snowden fitted himself for high place, not shirking the strenuous and unthankful task of political

propaganda, and his story should prove an inspiration to many young people to-day. They will be wise, however, to listen to Lord Snowden's advice :

> The old Socialist propaganda had been abandoned, and with its disappearance a good deal of the idealism had been lost. I have always deplored this change. Socialism had grown by the moral and idealistic appeal. I do not think the Socialist movement has ever recovered the enthusiasm and moral fervour which inspired it in those early days. When a party becomes concerned only with material reforms, and ceases to emphasize the moral purpose behind such reforms—important as material reforms are—it fails in its real purpose of the spiritual uplifting of the masses.

Perhaps the best way to write an autobiography is to keep a Journal and to write letters not intended for publication. Lord Esher's volumes will provide ample material for historians, and yet they cannot be held to be written for effect. A reference Lord Jellicoe makes to Mr. Lloyd George in his recent book on *The Submarine Peril* shows the statesman's strength and weakness as politician and historian alike :

> In this connection I recollect, when present at a meeting of the War Cabinet, hearing the Chief of the General Staff inform the Cabinet of the views of Sir Douglas Haig on some military operations. Mr. Lloyd George interrupted and said : "I do not agree with the Commander-in-Chief. I have a letter here from a subaltern in the trenches which gives an entirely different opinion."

His strength lies in his direct touch with reality and with the man on the spot, his preference of action to theory, and his determination to get all possible views. It is here that Esher shines. He writes from the centre of things, if with a little too much esteem for the royal persons he served. His opinions of men and things, written on the spur of the moment, while not always representing considered judgments, are yet of value. We get the atmosphere at once when we read of Campbell-Bannerman describing the Defence Committee as a "damnable, dictatorial domineering Trio," or when we read :

> Do you know Asquith? It is said that there is a chance of his marrying Margot. To be a Cabinet Minister and the husband of Miss Margot in one year, would indeed be to widen his experience of the world !

On the other hand, when he did not stick to his last he blundered, as when he said in 1906 :

> The *fact* is that the Nonconformists and Dr. Clifford care nothing for education. All they want is to humiliate the Church of England.

Esher the King called "the most valuable public servant I have" ; he was offered the War Office by both Parties, and invited to be Viceroy of India. This in itself suggests the manner of man he was, and his observations are as worth pondering as they were worth recording. He was excellent at summing up a personality, as many entries in these volumes testify. He had a specially good opinion of Balfour, Morley, and Edward VII.

Some of his references to individuals might be compared with Mr. Lloyd George's :

Gladstone :

> 1878.—Much as I am attracted by Mr. Gladstone in his quiet subdued moments, and great as he is, I am amazed that he should be

the idol of our sober people. While he was speaking I felt he was an enemy in politics and morals. He has led men by their passions rather than by their intellects. On his part this has not been cunning, but unconscious action. . . .

1880.—Mr. Gladstone is indignant with her [the Queen] and asserts that he would never be surprised to see her turn the Government out after the manner of her uncles. But this is the impulsive side of his character, rebelling against any interference from authority. He is ready to obey those whom he looks upon as his inferiors, but resents adverse opinion from anyone who is his equal or superior. He is, in short, an amiable tyrant.

1886.—. . . and what a Fox is the G.O.M.

Asquith:

1907.—Asquith's mind is a perfect instrument, and he takes points after the manner of a trained lawyer. But he lacks some element of character; perhaps hardiness. I should say he was a soft man; and his chin *recedes* when an attack is possible or imminent.

1908.—Cabinet making gives much insight into character. J. M. [Morley] told me yesterday some of the secrets. Lloyd George "put a pistol" to Asquith's head, and *asked* for the Ch. of the Ex. with a threat of resignation. He had previously, however, told Morley that he was about to do this, but *only* if J. M. waived his claim. This he instantly did. Lloyd George spoke deprecatingly of Asquith. His final summary of him was, "He is a man of no initiative, and requires to be briefed."

1909.—[Fisher] is a great public servant, and at the end of a long life, devoted to his profession and to the state he is the victim of Asquith's want of moral courage.

Rosebery:

1895.—R. said to me "You think I am a spoilt child," and I could not deny it. My wish for him is a time of great stress, popular hatred, unsupported except by the loyalty of a few, and a triumphant resurrection.

1908.—Rosebery's pitfall, too, was self-indulgence, luxury and love of praise, the shrinking from criticism. Yet all these things are inconsistent with the strenuous life.

Grey:

1906.—Grey is the only man who possesses the power of anticipation.

1908.—He is a statesman of the old early-Victorian school, honest, dignified, and unselfish. He is thoughtful and laborious, conscientious and scrupulous, with a high sense of duty, and no love of politics. But he is an Englishman to the backbone, and will never abdicate his right to help govern the country. We talked for an hour about fishing and the habits of fish; his *real* delight.

Haig:

1903.—In him Your Majesty possesses a very fine type of officer, practical, firm, and thoughtful, thoroughly experienced not only in war, but in military history.

Worthy of note are Esher's comments on the change that had come over the attitude of statesmen to their task. In 1903 he wrote:

Meanwhile, I read Mr. Gladstone's life, and realize the solemn way in which Peel and the men of his day took these things. To go into the Cabinet was a kind of sacrament.

As I said before, to men of the Peel and Gladstone type the duties of the State were religious functions of the highest moment. Modern Ministers "pick up" a Government much as an "eleven" would be picked up at school.

Then to this he recurred in 1908:

. . . At the Academy dinner Beresford tried not to see Jackie [Fisher] but Jackie *insisted* upon shaking hands with him. Clemenceau, whom I saw, has grown much older of late, but was as friendly and rational as ever. He dined with Asquith to meet most of the Cabinet. There were two bridge tables after dinner, and Asquith played. What a different atmosphere from the great Parliamentarians of *my* youth. Dizzy and Mr. G. breathed an altogether different air.

Men and women in their presence felt a sort of moral reserve, which some people feel in church. There was a certain advantage to the state in having at the head of affairs men who necessarily drew the best out of those they met. It kept order in the highest sphere of politics.

Perhaps you will think it altogether priggish, but I am sure that Bridge and Golf should be put aside—except in very "intime" life—by Prime Ministers and Sovereigns.

Esher saw with unusual clearness the coming of the conflict with Germany. In September, 1906, he wrote:

There is no doubt that within measurable distance there looms a titanic struggle between Germany and Europe for mastery. The years 1793-1815 will be repeated, only Germany, not France, will be trying for European domination. She has 70,000,000 of people and is determined to have commercial pre-eminence. To do this *England* has got to be crippled and the Low Countries added to the German Empire. France contains 40,000,000 of people. England about the same. So even combined, the struggle is by no means a certainty. Of course, the occupation of the Low Countries by Germany means the relegation of France to the second rank among European powers. . .

They [the Germans] mean to have a powerful fleet, and commercially to beat us out of the field, before ten years are over our heads. . .

There is a very bad time coming for soldiers; for the laws of historical and ethnographical evolution (it sounds rather priggish) require that we shall fight one of the most powerful military empires that has ever existed. This is *certain,* and we have a very short period of preparation. I fear that proficiency in games, or on the hunting-field, will not help our poor lads much when they have to face the carefully trained and highly educated German officers. . . .

The foreign policy of E. Grey, or any other Secretary of State, might land us any day in a similar plight. We have an Army in excess of our requirements for "small wars"—and wholly inadequate to the demands of a great war. . . . Germany *must* stretch out her limbs seawards. This means perpetual threats to Belgium and Holland. It is only a *question of time.* Are we to depend upon "alliances" or upon ourselves? That is the question.

Again, in 1908:

. . . The whole of this bother shows how vital it is that while there is yet time we should put our naval and military forces in perfect order. Nothing can prevent a struggle for life except the certainty that attack would fail. I am sure that the Germans are very patient and very

bold. The sort of supremacy which Napoleon dreamed of for France, and nearly achieved—commercial as well as political—they desire as well as the former. And all their efforts are directed to that. The great obstacle is England. They do not want to conquer but to crush.

A study of these three books leaves one with two definite impressions. Firstly, the utter futility of war, when men, so human, so fallible, so blundering, make war—and peace. If all the peoples of the world could but read for themselves of the jealousies, the factions, and the intrigues that went on while men were dying by the million there would be no more wars. There seems to be something to be said for the proposal that at the outbreak of war it should be a rule to execute at once the Cabinets, the General Staffs, and the diplomatists who have led the nation into war. If 50 such in each country could be sent to the block that would probably be the end of the bloodshed and the end of all wars!

Secondly, that Prof. Temperley has spoken with authority in laying down that historical method and scientific inquiry demand that all the evidence must be heard before a verdict can be reached. *Ex parte* statements, defences, apologias, and whatnot we have in abundance. But these are part only and not the whole. What is the truth about Grey and his policy? Is Esher's judgment of Grey correct or Mr. Lloyd George's? What is the truth about Asquith, about Haig, and about Mr. Lloyd George himself? What is the truth about Passchendaele, about Mr. Lloyd George's supersession of Asquith in December, 1916? (His own story is unconvincing to the *n*th degree.) Even those who took part in the Cabinet crisis of 1931 give very divergent versions of what happened. How difficult it is to find the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

ALBERT PEEL.

WORTH NOTING.

FROM RECENT BOOKS.

That is the constant Nemesis of what we call "progress." Any new or even re-discovered truth is, for the moment, more important to us than what we already possess. Men will die to make a very small discovery; but, when it is made, and securely our own, it falls into its proper place, and is seen to be far less important than some of our former knowledge.

ALFRED NOYES, *The Unknown God.*

In every hamlet of this thickly populated district stood the tidy, clean Mosque from which five times each day the call to prayer rang forth, and in response to which the snowy-turbaned elders bowed in homage. No missionary superintends, no society supports, no elaborate organization controls, yet since Islam captured this land, its power seems to have steadily increased, and to-day it prides itself on presenting an invincible front to the Christian message.

[Of the Sven Hedin explorers]

> The loneliness and hardship endured by these scientists, and the industry with which they pursue their object, is a rebuke to the missionary. They have literally left father, mother, wife, house and lands and all that they have, for the sake of science.

MILDRED CABLE AND F. & E. FRENCH, *A Desert Journal.*

Where the ethical conception of Christianity prevails there is no place for sacraments in the traditional sense of that term—no place, that is, for means of grace which are addressed to a non-ethical, non-personal nature or substance, supposed to constitute the substratum of human life. Means employed to affect or control such a nature belong in the category of magic, however spiritually they may be phrased. We should not be deceived by the sounds of words. We are apt to take for granted that the term spiritual means ethical and personal over against the material and impersonal. But, as a matter of fact, throughout Christian history it has also had another meaning as far from the personal and ethical sphere as the conception of matter itself. And wherever a spiritual presence of Christ in the sacraments is talked about which makes them any more than mere signs or testimonies or appeals to the mind and heart, there the word spiritual is used in this physical non-ethical sense, and we are as truly in the sphere of magic as any Roman Catholic with his doctrine of transubstantiation.

What then should be the attitude of the modern Protestant to the sacraments? Must he, in consistency, repudiate them, or may he continue to observe them with a good conscience? If he believes that Christ instituted them and commanded their continued observance I suppose he may feel compelled to retain them even though he finds himself out of sympathy with them. But if he believes as I do . . . that Jesus instituted neither baptism nor the Lord's Supper, he will be perfectly free to judge them solely on their merits.

If I thought that their continued observance tended to promote the old non-ethical idea of Christianity, then I for one, much as I am attached to them, should think it far better to give them up altogether and to rely for inspiration upon other and more strictly ethical means. And if the orthodox doctrines were generally held, I do not see how they could fail to promote that idea. For whether Catholic, Lutheran, Anglican or Reformed, that doctrine is at bottom the same, and is neither ethical nor Christian.

But so far as I can discover, comparatively few Protestants, at any rate in Presbyterian and Congregational churches, are really orthodox on the subject. To most of them apparently baptism, if it has any meaning at all, is simply a ceremony of dedication or consecration, and the Lord's Supper a memorial of Christ or a token of our Christian fellowship. If this be all they are, I can see no harm in them, and I can understand, indeed I know, that great inspiration and good may come from their observance.

But three things seem to me important. In the first place, we ought to be diligent to reinterpret them for our people and to ethicize them through and through. In the second place we ought to cease calling them "sacraments." The word has historically a very definite meaning and to continue to employ it when that meaning has been repudiated not only tends to deceive others, but also exposes us to the constant danger of the return of the old physical and non-ethical conceptions for which the word historically stands.

In the third place I believe it should be made clear to all the people that we do not regard participation in either ceremony as essential to membership or good standing in our churches. We condemn the Baptists for requiring immersion in order to church membership. We are just as much to be condemned if we require baptism. The one is no more *necessary* than the other. Let us continue to observe the rite, which has a peculiar beauty and significance—especially when given to infants—but let us not *require* it. Also let us make our members clearly understand that attendance upon the Lord's Supper—beautiful and inspiring as the ceremony is—is equally optional and is required of *no* Christian and of *no* church member.

In these ways the modicum of misunderstanding that still attaches to the two ceremonies—if there be any misunderstanding of them left to-day in our churches—may be overcome, and the two rites do all the good they are fitted to do and none of the harm they have sometimes done.

A. C. McGiffert, *Christianity as History and Faith.*

FOREIGN REVIEWS.

La Foi à la Resurrection de Jésus dans le Christianisme Primitif. Par MAURICE GOGUEL. Paris: Leroux. 50 fr.

The author of this volume is one of the most distinguished scholars of French Protestantism; and this work is worthy of his high reputation. It shows an extraordinary range of learning; all the relevant literature, ancient and modern, seems to be put under contribution to illustrate or to support his argument. It displays an acute faculty of literary and historical criticism. Much as one may differ from the startlingly negative conclusions, one cannot but admire the skill with which the author arranges his materials and marshals his vast army of evidence for these conclusions. His well-known *La Vie de Jésus,* which has been translated into English, closes the history of Jesus with His death, as he does regard the Resurrection as belonging, not to the history of Jesus, but to the history of primitive Christianity, not as a fact to be recorded, but as the object of the faith which made the Church.

The problem which he now sets himself is by a critical survey and estimate of the *N.T.* literature to deny *the fact of history* and yet to affirm *the object of faith.* In the first part he passes in review the primitive church in Jerusalem, the Pauline theology, the popular faith, the Deutero-paulinism, the Johannine theology, and the Apostolic Fathers Clement and Ignatius, to show that the faith in the living Lord who had triumphed over death was independent of the tradition both of the empty grave and of the appearances, to which appeal was made for the apologetic.

In the second part the tradition, which is regarded not as the basis, but as the product of the faith, is subjected to a meticulous criticism. According to the author, the burial is represented as being in the tradition either a humiliation or an exaltation, as due to the desire to meet Jewish ritual requirements or to show honour. He assumes the place of the hasty burial to have been unknown, so that when the tradition of the empty tomb emerged refutation was impossible. The earliest conception of the resurrection as an immediate exaltation to heavenly glory, he argues, deprived the question of the buried body of any crucial importance. Only the later conception of the literal resurrection of the body as well as the survival of the spirit gave occasion for affirming the empty grave. So also the tradition of three days is held to have no historical basis, but to be due to varied motives. In an appendix the two explanations offered of the empty grave —theft by the apostles, and apparent death—are, however, rejected. The apologetic of the Church combined with the evidence of the empty grave that of the appearances. The records of these in the Pauline Epistles, the Gospels, and later literature are subjected to the same meticulous criticism, and are deprived of any historical value unless as showing the development of the faith from the belief in immediate transition to the heavenly life to an increasing materialization of the restoration of the body from the grave. The Transfiguration is regarded as one of the post-resurrection theophanies which has been transferred to the story of the historical ministry. The Ascension is also explained as an artificial termination of the series of appearances, thus depriving Paul's vision on the way to Damascus of a character similar to these appearances. The descent into Hades is shown to be, in the allusions to it, compounded of three aims, to affirm the reality of the death, to claim a mission of preaching to the dead, to demonstrate by His death a victory of Christ over Satan.

Having thus disposed of the alleged evidence in the literature for the fact of the Resurrection, the author in the third part offers the psychology

of the theophanies. He sets aside as improbable the influence of pagan myths of dying and reviving gods, but mentions some modern religious visions as offering an analogy. The details of the other appearances being inadequate and uncertain, he confines himself to the conversion of Paul, denying that there was any preparation for it, as has been maintained, in the influence on him of the attitude of the persecuted Christians, or in a moral crisis, in which he discovered his own moral impotence.

Goguel's aim, finally, seems to be to affirm the religious value of these subjective experiences, and to justify as a spontaneous corporate development the tradition in which this experience gave itself objectivity. It was the faith in His Messiahship and His future exaltation which Jesus in His ministry inspired in His disciples; this, after a brief interruption by His death, was continued as faith in the Resurrection, which, itself independent of any outward evidence, was strong enough to create the evidence by which it sought to convince the world.

It is impossible to deal with such an argument in its details. Able as the presentation is, I have found it quite unconvincing. The *N.T.* literature is deprived of any historical value except as an expression of the development of the subjective faith to the objectivity which is its creation. Much ingenuity is displayed in accounting for features of the *N.T.* record, the explanation of which is obvious, if the record is treated as substantially historical. That there are difficulties, obscurities, and discrepancies in the evidence offered for the Resurrection must be frankly conceded; but this French scholar is more negative in his criticism than most British scholars would regard as justified by an impartial examination and estimate of the value of the data. His intention is not, however, to deny the validity of the faith, but only the value of the evidence advanced for it. This let me concede; the faith must find an inward witness in personal experience, if the outward evidence is to afford any confirmation to it. The Resurrection as a central feature of the divine revelation in Christ can be believed only where there is the human religion, receptive of and responsive to the divine revelation, grace evoking the faith which apprehends and appreciates its content.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

From Tradition to Gospel. By MARTIN DIBELIUS, Ph.D., D.Th. Translated from the Revised Second Edition of *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*. Nicholson & Watson. 8s. 6d.

There have been many references to *Formgeschichte* in these pages, and no doubt there will be many more, and all of them will pay tribute to the contribution Dr. Martin Dibelius made to *N.T.* scholarship by directing attention to what has been called "the Gospel behind the Gospels." To the industry of Dr. Woolf and the enterprise of the publishers we owe this welcome English translation, for which Biblical students who do not read German will be extremely grateful.

We do not propose to discuss again the contentions of Dr. Dibelius at this stage, but merely to draw attention to the translation, in which Dr. Woolf has had the co-operation of the author. At times it reads like a translation and does not reach the English idiom; as, for example,

> Such queries as Wellhausen has set down with great energy threaten the assurance of the usual confidence in the Source Q, and show of what great consequence a decision on this subject can be.

But when the work of translation is so difficult and the task so thankless, it would be ungracious to complain, and our main note is one of gratitude to Dr. Woolf for facilitating the study of the *N.T.*, and to his publishers for issuing the results of his labours at a reasonable price.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

" Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

" A good book is the precious life-blood of a master spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(*The place of publication is London and the date* 1934 *unless otherwise stated*).

Religious Thought in the 18th Century. By J. M. CREED and J. S. BOYCE-SMITH. Cambridge Press. 10s. 6d.

Nature, Man and God. By WILLIAM TEMPLE, Archbishop of York. Macmillan. 18s.

We fear sometimes that Congregationalism compares very badly with Anglicanism in its output of scholarship. Of course, there are excuses: it has no canonries, few easy Chairs, and no sinecures. Its scholars are mostly engaged in pastoral work, or in colleges where administrative duties are added to teaching. Nevertheless, when we look back over 1934 we wish we had a little more to our credit. Mr. Matthews's *Calamy Revised* is perhaps the outstanding achievement; but apart from Dr. Franks's Dale Lectures and Mr. Wigley's book, both reviewed within, there is little else. These reflections were caused by the appearance together on our table of these two weighty books by Anglicans.

The first comes from Cambridge and is the work of two Dons, whose work will save much time for students. Recently, when examining three theological College libraries which had accumulated in the 18th and early 19th centuries, we were struck by the tremendous output of books on the deistic controversy, and we could not help but wonder if it would ever be worth anybody's while to follow through the controversy on natural and revealed religion. Cambridge Dons evidently have time even for this, for *Religious Thought in the 18th Century* consists of classified extracts from writers of the period, prefixed by brief biographies. Locke, Toland, Paley, Whiston, Sherlock, Hume, Law, Berkeley, Butler, Lessing, Kant, Spinoza, Hoadly, Warburton, Burke, Priestley—these are by no means all the names, but they will indicate the scope of the book.

The second book, the Archbishop of York's Gifford Lectures, is the work of one of the busiest men in the country. It is amazing to us how Dr. Temple, with the manifold claims on his time, and the innumerable addresses he delivers, manages to secure opportunity for concentrated thought and its adequate expression. We marvel none the less despite the Archbishop's assurance that his decisive thinking goes on unconsciously, when he is walking or asleep.

The Lectures, which are divided into two sections, "The Transcendence of the Immanent" and "The Immanence of the Transcendent," begin with the distinction between natural and revealed religion which occupied 18th century thought, but they reach out to the numerous problems connected with the trinity of the title, Nature, Man, God. The first part, after examining the tension between philosophy and religion, the "Cartesian *faux pas*," the special activity of Mind and the general character of the world process, discusses truth, beauty, and moral goodness, and then in lectures on "Process, Mind and Value," "Freedom and Determinism,"

and "The Transcendence of the Immanent" (in which Dr. Temple leaves Dr. Whitehead, with whom he has previously walked in step) leads up to the conclusion that there is at work in the cosmic process a spirit which also transcends it, a spirit that is good. Part II begins with further consideration of the terms "immanent" and "transcendent," this naturally preparing for the examination of the problems connected with revelation, authority, "Finitude and Evil," and "Divine Grace and Human Freedom." The last four Lectures, though they are by no means easy to read, are the most interesting in the book to non-philosophers. A preacher's study circle could discuss to advantage the question propounded in "The Meaning of History": "Does History make any difference or not to the Eternal?" The Lecture on "Moral and Religious Conditions of Eternal Life" does well to remind us that, except as an implicate of the righteousness and love of God, immortality is not a religious interest at all. "The Sacramental Universe" and "The Hunger of Natural Religion" (with Browning aptly used) conclude that man fails to meet his own deepest need, which is not progress but redemption, and Natural Religion ends in a hunger for a specific Revelation.

Such is a brief outline of a volume which is not unworthy to stand in the notable series to which it belongs, a book which ratifies Benjamin Whichcote's dictum: "Sir, I oppose not rational to spiritual, for spiritual is most rational."

EDITOR.

Force. By LORD DAVIES. Benn. 21s.

Peace with Honour. By A. A. MILNE. Methuen. 5s.

Lord Davies's is a dear, but important, book. In it he appears once more as a champion of an international tribunal and an international police force, and he writes with such cogency and earnestness that it is a pleasure to read what is a truly powerful plea. The crucial problem of our times he believes to be that of the right use of force, and

> When force is the handmaid of justice it becomes the executor of right and the custodian of peace.

After examining illegitimate use of force (Ireland, the Colonies, and Mandates are discussed—"unless the League is able to assert its authority the mandate system also goes by the board") Lord Davies claims that Hobbes's words are still true:

> Covenants without the sword are but words, and of no strength to secure a man at all.

The exercise of force is limited, however, to the police function, its aim being to bring an offender before the tribunal; and an appeal is made to Youth, to the Churches, and to the League of Nations Union to support the establishment of a system when such force will be employed. Youth "must make its choice between red, brown, and black shirts and the policeman's uniform," for non-participation is stupid, futile, and impracticable, as the Socialists found in 1914; the Churches should support the scheme because

> The right use of force in the governance of the world implies the application of the redemptive principle in the international sphere.

Lord Davies has small patience with the pacifists, or indeed, with anybody to whom his policy does not seem as crystal-clear as it does to himself. We wish he had gone into details on the practical side. Whence is the police force to be drawn, where are to be its head-quarters, what its equipment (apparently it is to be an Air Force), and how is it to be maintained? And how, for example, would Lord Davies have made it function against Japan in 1933?

It may well be that the next step forward in the struggle for peace will be the establishment of such a system as is here outlined. Lord Davies deserves our gratitude for his pertinacity, for the clearness with which he writes, and the mental stimulus he gives.

We are getting along. First Mr. Beverley Nichols and now Mr. A. A. Milne comes down on the pacifist side. With irony sustained throughout Mr. Milne argues cogently and well, though one or two cheap gibes weaken the book's appeal and should have been blue-pencilled. To renounce aggression, Mr. Milne urges, is not enough: we must also renounce defence. The leaders of all countries, including the King in this country, must take a solemn oath to renounce all war, and all disputes must be submitted to arbitration. Most readers will agree with Mr. Milne that if forty leaders of the nations were to be executed on the outbreak of war, that outbreak would never occur. It is to be hoped that Mr. Milne will secure a hearing in circles where ordinary peace propaganda fails to find an entry. Such an accession to the cause of peace, and the armaments revelations in the United States, in a single quarter are decidedly encouraging to fighters for peace.

EDITOR.

The Holiness of Jesus. By A. D. MARTIN. Allen & Unwin. 10s. 6d.

By holiness the author means "the coalescence of a perfectly good mind with a fully energetic will, the coincidence of the Ideal and the Real in continuous activity." As such it is "the differentia of Deity" (there being "a fundamental difference between man and God"). It has two aspects, the ethical (God's essential goodness) and the numinous (God's "awe-inspiringness"). Of these the ethical is primary: "the awe-inspiringness of God is due to his essential goodness." God is indeed "ever giving out of Himself," and so it comes about that men are sometimes called "holy;" but this is a loose use of the word. In the strict sense, holiness necessarily involves sinlessness, and therefore "never in mortal life—unless . . . in the life of Jesus Christ—are men holy with the Holiness of God."

Mr. Martin is on very solid ground in his contention that the ethical goodness of Jesus was uniquely great, and that His presence and character conveyed to men the impression of a superhuman and awe-inspiring majesty. This theme is worked out with skill and insight; and the author is to be thanked for the convincing way in which the positive evidence is handled. He does well to affirm with E. F. Scott: "In the religion of Jesus we cannot overlook the significance of Jesus Himself."

It is doubtful, however, whether his arguments on the subject of sinlessness will bear the weight he puts upon them. Regarding the general principle, one may ask why—if "the awe-inspiringness of God is due to His essential goodness"—the application of the term "holy" to good men (who are not sinless) should be counted a loose use of words, seeing that Jesus insisted that goodness in God and man was qualitatively the same, and that in the *N.T.* imperfect Christians are repeatedly called "holy" (ἅγιοι). Further, in order to prove historically that Jesus was sinless, Mr. Martin has to commit several acts of critical violence. He has to discount the extreme fragmentariness of the records, and the known impossibility of proving a universal negative. He has to adopt a definition of sin ("a *deliberate* departure from the *known* Will of God"—italics mine), which—however popular with modern theologians—corresponds neither to the Jewish view of sin (as including roughly *all* imperfection), nor to the consciousness of men, who often find to their sorrow that they have sinned unintentionally (cf. *Ps.* 19^{12}; Shaw, *Saint Joan,* pp. 95-97). In connexion with the baptism

of Jesus he has to accept wholly improbable midrash like that of *Matt.* 3^{14f} (one among the *many* little pieces of edifying fiction scattered throughout this Gospel), and to reject the much better evidence of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* (which exactly matches the psychology of the position, and which no Christian, not even an Ebionite, would have dared to invent). And of course we have the usual special pleading in regard to "Why callest thou me good?". I share Mr. Martin's belief that Jesus is not to be blamed for any of those things in His life and teaching for which some modern critics have blamed Him, as also the general thesis of the book regarding His "goodness" and "holiness"; but I demur to scanty historical evidence being pressed to show that Jesus believed Himself to possess a negative quality which His Jewish training and piety would have strongly deterred Him from claiming, but which has become a veritable obsession with many modern theologians. Mr. Martin's arguments under this heading seem to me to partake sometimes of that unimaginative inelasticity and violence for which he is so ready to blame those modern critics with whom he happens to disagree.

The case is the same in the discussion of the intellectual limitations of Jesus. That there were such limitations Mr. Martin frankly concedes : but he claims to know exactly how far they went. They might, for example, account for Jesus not knowing that David was not the author of *Ps.* 110. But they could not have meant that He was mistaken as regards the reality of demon-possession, or as regards the form and time of His own Parousia. Why this distinction? Because error regarding demon-possession and Parousia would have been inconsistent with sinlessness : moreover, it is just possible that demons do actually possess people, and that the whole of the first generation of disciples misunderstood their Master's eschatology. Such arguing amounts surely to imposing a theory on the records rather than deriving a theory from them.

On a number of special points, where his theory is not so deeply involved, Mr. Martin commits himself to untenable positions. His contention, *e.g.*, that the Synoptic Gospels are not governed by doctrinal purposes is palpably mistaken : one does not need the Synoptists' "comments" to prove its falsity (though comments are not absent)—a study of the way they treat their sources is sufficient. Mr. Martin believes that Jesus fed a crowd *twice* : he rejects the distinction between nature-miracles and healing-miracles (despite the fact that the former are absent from our two earliest sources, "Q" and "L") : he gives Papias an impossibly late date, and mistranslates him : he finds no difficulty in accepting the almost certainly artificial setting of *Matt.* $20^{1\text{-}16}$ as the true one (*cf.* 19^{30} with $20^{8\ \text{fin, }16}$) : he thinks Jesus could have used the words ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστέ in *Mk.* 9^{41}. These instances are quoted to show that, despite Mr. Martin's impatience with what he considers the pedantry, *etc.*, of many modern critics, his own critical views are frequently open to very grave objection. And I feel bound to deplore that he has joined that great company of Christians who inexcusably persist in misquoting *Matt.* 22^{42} (in the *A.V.*, of course) for the sake of its rhetorical effect. There is a misprint on p. 92 and a wrong accentuation on p. 221 : and I do not know quite what to make of the statement on p. 90 that "The Synoptists never attribute to Jesus declarations of loving regard for people of any kind."

But despite these strictures, the book is a welcome addition to our literature on the character and life of our Lord; and its general thesis that the character of Jesus was supremely good and His person truly numinous, and integral to His own Gospel of the Kingdom, is thoroughly justified and timely.

C. J. Cadoux.

The Call of Israel. By W. J. PHYTHIAN-ADAMS. Oxford Press. 8s. 6d.

This "introduction to the study of Divine Election" is a rather unusual but welcome combination of constructive criticism with religious faith. The book falls into three parts. In the first the author works back from the faith of the Psalmists in the divine choice of Israel to that of the Prophets on whom it is founded and so to the faith of an earlier Israel. In the second, this traditional faith is examined in reference to the alleged historic events on which it is based, with full recognition of the difficulties raised by literary criticism; attention is concentrated on the Ark, the priests as its guardians, and the tables of stone. In the third, the miracle of the call is interpreted as the combination of a widespread volcanic and seismic upheaval with a new (prophetic) idea of God.

It is in the emphasis on this combination of faith and event that the theological value of the book consists. The thesis is in some respects similar to that of Weiser in his *Glaube und Geschichte im Alten Testament* and of Galling in his *Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels,* with neither of which does the author appear to be acquainted. He rightly claims for his interpretation that it preserves the true values of "miracle," by its recognition of both purely external phenomena and spiritual experience. To these factors he adds a third which he calls "sacramental coincidence"; by this he means the capacity of further interpretation and development, as Israel came to realize the redemptive significance of these events in their spiritual context.

This is the main theme of the book. Some of its incidental positions, though ingenious and challenging, are more open to doubt. The author minimizes the tradition that Kadesh-Barnea was the centre for nomadic Israel and places the Mount of God to the east of Akabah; he will not allow any Midianite influence on the faith of Moses; he asserts (rather strangely) the presence of all the tribes in Egypt on what seems a misreading of the Song of Deborah, and puts an emphasis on the Pillar of Cloud which seems exaggerated. It is not possible to argue here as to these and other details, and in any case they do not radically affect the conclusion. The parallels of volcanic and seismic phenomena which he cites copiously are of much interest, and they enable him to offer an interesting explanation of the plagues of Egypt. Altogether, the book, which is carefully documented, is well worth reading.

H. WHEELER ROBINSON.

Jesus Christ and Primitive Need. By CHARLES PELHAM GROVES, B.A., B.D. Epworth Press. 6s.

The Ideals of East and West. By KENNETH SAUNDERS, Litt.D. Cambridge Press. 10s. 6d.

Zoroastrianism. By JOHN W. WATERHOUSE, B.A., B.D. Epworth Press. 2s. 6d.

The truth of the Christian message does not depend on the extent to which men see in it the answer to their need. It is true because it is God's Word to men. But its truth finds confirmation in the answer that it makes to that quest for the divine which is among the most ancient and most universal of all human quests. We have long learnt that it is impossible to see in the Higher Religions of the East only folly. They are quests for truth, though marred, as all things human are, by sin, and they look beyond themselves to a satisfaction only Christ can give. And in recent years the study of primitive religion and anthropology has shown that even primitive religion may not be discussed as if it were only superstition.

A new and vaster apologia for Christianity is being made in which the Christian gospel appears as the one sufficient answer to the spiritual aspirations of our race. To that apologia Mr. Groves's book makes a notable contribution.

One of the difficulties which beset any comparison of Christianity with a phase of non-Christian religion arises from such comparison being between the known and the unknown. Most Western readers know something of Christianity; they know little, if anything, of non-Christian religions. That difficulty is accentuated if, as in this book, the statement of Christianity is given first—and it has reference not only to the aspirations of primitive religion but also to that indifference to history typical of Hinduism and Buddhism.

This first part of the book is entitled "The Christian Message in History and Experience." It describes the Event, and relates the connexion of that Event to History. There are interesting illustrations of the danger that some sections of the *O.T.* are only too congenial to modern converts from paganism. The second part deals first with "The Characterization of Simple Folk," under the headings of "The Life Struggle," "The Social Bond," "The Mystic Environment." Here Mr. Groves uses, with admirable aptness, experience gained in his thirteen years' service in Nigeria. The third part—"Good News for Simple Folk"—speaks of "The Essential Need," "The Stature of the Manhood of Christ," and "The Missionary Approach."

If the book deals with more aspects of the problem than its title suggests, that only increases its interest. Always Mr. Groves writes as one who remembers that, as he puts it, "the Christian Message is not a new system of ideas, but news—Good News." For those who work among simple people this book has special interest, but it is of value to us all, for it is only as the Christian Gospel is looked at from the standpoint of all men's needs that its completeness can be realized.

It is impossible to read this profoundly Christian study without a new sense of the Gospel's ability to meet the aspirations of barbarians as of Greeks.

Books on the comparative study of religion are many; less numerous are books concerned with the comparative study of ethics. *The Ideals of East and West* provides an excellent introduction to this study. The book has those high characteristics which we have learned to expect from Dr. Saunders—literary skill, genial tolerance, and accurate knowledge derived not only from books but from wide travel and friendship with men of many lands. The book deals successively with The Ethics of India, of the Chinese, the Japanese, the Greeks, the Hebrews, and with Christian Ethics.

For the first three chapters we have only praise. In each of them Dr. Saunders with admirable skill describes the development of ethical ideals. Thus in his chapters on India in the space of twenty pages he covers three thousand years, and yet succeeds in making his chapters read not as a dull epitome, but as a fascinating record of human achievement. Nearly as long as the chapters are the illustrative quotations appended to them. It would have been easy so to quote as to misrepresent. Dr. Saunders, instead, so quotes as to give a clear impression of the various ethical ideals, and derives his material not only from the Sacred Books but from popular proverbs.

To the reviewer the chapter, "The Ethics of the Hebrews," seems to be less sympathetic and therefore less valuable, and that on Christian Ethics inadequate. This impression may be due to an endeavour to preserve strict impartiality. But there was more excuse ten years ago than there is now for his statement that

> Christianity won the ancient world largely as a mystery-religion, and in Pauline and Johannine thought we see abundant proof of the influence of these cults.

And Dr. Saunders's interpretation of the title "Son of Man" as True Man or Representative Man is scarcely possible to-day, whilst the description of the Four Gospels as "theological tracts" is surely inapposite. *Mark,* at any rate, cannot be so described. Dr. Saunders refers in this section to two of Dean Inge's works, but the chapter as a whole seems to suggest that he has been too absorbed in his study of Eastern religions to keep his reading up-to-date in Christian scholarship and theology. A very attractive presentation of our Lord's teaching on love would have gained much from the study of such a book as Nygren's *Agape and Eros.* Love, in the distinctive Christian sense of *Agape,* is something other than human love at its highest.

Though here and there we differ from Dr. Saunders's judgment, we very warmly recommend this book to all who would learn of the ethical ideals of the East. Learned as is this book it is written with consummate literary skill. It is hard to see how a book dealing with so complex a theme could be written with more lucidity and grace.

Zoroastrianism is yet another volume in the "Great Religions of the East" series edited by Dr. Eric S. Waterhouse. The very fact that Avestan scholars are so few makes the task of writing an elementary handbook difficult, for on many matters of moment there is as yet no concensus of opinion. Mr. Waterhouse has given us a competent and clearly written textbook, written primarily for College students offering the History of Religions as a subject for the B.D. This book will be of use to any who desire a simple introduction to the study of a religion which, though it has few adherents in the modern world, is yet of special interest because of the sublimity of the teaching of its great founder.

SYDNEY CAVE.

The Sāktas. By E. A. PAYNE, B.D., B.Litt. Oxford Press. 5s. 6d.

Shintoism. By A. C. UNDERWOOD, M.A., D.D. Epworth Press. 2s. 6d.

The Sāktas appears in the "Religious Life of India" series, to which frequent reference has been made in these columns. Mr. Payne has in some ways had a harder task than any who have contributed to the series. The worship of the female counterpart or power of the god is in ill-repute because of its connexion with cruelty and lust. The murderous movement of the Thugs connected itself with the cult of Kāli. A generation ago *Bande Matharam, Bow to the Mother,* was the watchword of violent Nationalists. Even in quiet Travancore some of us had that shouted at us. The reviewer well remembers, when he had been only a few months in India, seeing in a shop window near his home a picture of the Goddess Kāli cutting off the heads of Europeans, among them an Anglican missionary in proper clerical attire and a Free Church missionary in that frock-coat and white tie which we did not wear.

In South India the much feared Kāli is regarded as much as a she-devil as a goddess, and with her is associated those she-devils who are the most dreaded of the demons, for "the female of the species is more deadly than the male." The translations of Tantric hymns made by the writer who called himself "Arthur Avalon" do not inspire enthusiasm for this cult. And in its left-hand form the Sākta movement has been associated with obscenity and even incest. It is not surprising that this movement has been described as "lust, mummery, and black magic." But that description is too summary. We have only to turn to the poems of a *sakti*-poet

like Rāmprasād Sen to realize how the worship of the Divine as Mother can arouse awe and adoration even although confidence in her love be mingled with dread and resentment of her caprice. Nature in a tropical land does seem like an ignorant and ill-disciplined mother, alternating between moods of tenderness and anger. The worship of the Goddess is not only a natural rationalization of men's experience of Nature's changeableness; it is also a natural expression of the tender and terrifying aspects of the Divine—the *fascinosum-tremendum* of the numinous, to use Otto's terms. It leads at once to the conception of the loving Mother with her babe and of Kāli trampling on her prostrate foe with outstretched and bloody tongue and with a garland of skulls around her almost naked form.

It is significant that this goddess-worship is not confined to the ignorant. The Sākta movement has penetrated deeply into Hinduism as into Buddhism. Unpretentious in appearance as is Mr. Payne's book, it gives a full, illuminating, and amazingly sympathetic account of this movement—an account which owes much of its insight to Mr. Payne's wide interest in the history of religion. This is a book which all interested in Hinduism will need to read.

In the last number of this *Quarterly* attention was drawn to the first two volumes of a new series, *Great Religions of the East,* edited by Professor Waterhouse. This third volume shows to the full those qualities of competence and lucidity which distinguished the earlier volumes. To many of us *Shinto* is the least interesting of living religions. The ancient books in which it is expressed, the *Kojiki* and the *Nihongi,* are among the most tedious of books, and Shinto, whether in its ancient or its modern form, seems to have little to contribute to the spiritual heritage of the race. Yet the religion of Japan cannot be understood without reference to this, its indigenous element. Nor can the self-effacing patriotism of the Japanese be appreciated without some understanding of the association of the sacredness of the Imperial dynasty with the divinity of the islands of Japan. Shinto in its sectarian forms may be only of interest to those who reside in Japan. In its State-form it suggests the "Cæsarism" of the Roman Empire. This State-Shinto is not only a perplexity to the Christian Church of Japan: it concerns us all, for it inspires a fanatical patriotism which is a menace to the peace of the world.

Dr. Underwood's account of Shinto is not only clear and instructive: he has succeeded where most writers on Shinto fail, and has made this element of Japanese religion interesting. We warmly welcome this latest addition to a very useful series.

SYDNEY CAVE.

The Atonement. By R. S. FRANKS. Oxford Press. 6s.

This is a small book but a very weighty one. It consists of the Dale Lectures recently given in Mansfield College and is a fitting sequel to Dr. Franks's earlier and larger book, *The History of the Doctrine of the Work of Christ.* It is altogether suitable that the Dale Lectures should be given on a subject which Dr. Dale had made his own and with which his name will always be associated. Dr. Franks's position, however, is very different from that of Dale. He openly and avowedly accepts the Abelardian doctrine that

> Christ reconciles men to God by revealing the love of God in His life and still more in His death, so bringing them to trust and love Him in return.

He entirely abandons all those judicial, governmental, substitutionary, and sacrificial theories which have for so long held sway. While his approach to the subject is experiential, he is not satisfied with experience alone but

seeks to establish it on a metaphysic of religion. The whole treatment of the subject is clear, cogent, and extremely interesting, and will bring relief to many troubled minds.

Most important are the lectures on The Experiential Doctrine of the Atonement, on The Metaphysic of Christianity, and The Forgiveness of Sins. In regard to the latter Dr. Franks insists throughout on the primacy of the divine initiative and on the love of God as central to the whole Christian position. He believes that forgiveness comes about through making the sinner forgivable.

> The problem of the Atonement is just that of bringing the sinner truly to acknowledge and confess his sin and to turn in trustful obedience to the Father. That is what Christ does, manifesting the love of God in the Cross.

The saving power of the Cross is not in any theory of it but in the love of which it is the manifestation; and the Cross makes the sin forgivable by creating penitence and trust. In his last lecture, which is a recapitulation, Dr. Franks deals very effectively with the problem as to how the Atonement can best be preached. He says:

> We have to preach in the *spirit* of the Atonement; so that the Cross not only shines by its own light, but illuminates everything else. Above all we have to live in the spirit of the Atonement. Whatever be the case with other doctrines of the Atonement, the gospel of the love of God in Christ can only be preached effectively by those who prove the truth of their preaching by exhibiting the power of that love in their own lives. It is the practical issue of the gospel of the Atonement, that, kindled by the power of the Divine Love, we should by that same power kindle others.

It is impossible in a brief review to give any general idea of the wealth of material in this great little book, but we hope we have said enough to induce people to read it for themselves; those who do so will have their reward.

W. B. Selbie.

Contemporary Mind. By J. W. N. Sullivan. Toulmin. 8s. 6d.

Mr. Sullivan is a journalist, and the essays which make up this book are journalism of the best kind. By "contemporary mind" he means really the scientific outlook, and in order to illustrate his main contentions he gives the result of interviews with a number of living thinkers such as Sir Josiah Stamp, Sir Arthur Eddington, Sir James Jeans, M. Painlevé, Messrs. Aldous Huxley, Max Planck, H. G. Wells, and others. Along with these interviews there are essays on the Balanced Life, the Problem of Suffering, Human Immortality, and Mysticism, and dissertations on Clerk Maxwell and Newton.

Mr. Sullivan's defence of the Greek ideal of a balanced and ordered life is admirable, but he never quite gets away from the difficulty raised by the problem of suffering. He says:

> For the normal consciousness, the existence of what appears to be entirely gratuitous suffering is an insuperable objection to the belief that life has a meaning. The only escape from this conclusion depends on the acceptance of the validity and relevance of the mystic vision.

In discussing such questions as the Meaning of Life, the Function of Consciousness, and the Idea of Progress with some of the greatest modern scientists two points at least emerge: first, their tendency to stress the principle of indeterminacy, and even the possibility of free will as over against the necessitarianism which was once in vogue; and secondly, the extreme modesty and even proper agnosticism with which they state their conclusions. We must agree with Sir James Jeans when he says, "I do

not think I have the right to give a definite opinion on any of the questions we have discussed." It may therefore be possible to argue that modern science at least leaves the way open for a *preparatio evangelica*. Mr. Sullivan does not go so far as this, though he does suggest that there is a place for religious institutions, and sums up his position by saying

> that the most advanced forms of these institutions are to be found in mysticism and the mystical solution, when various solutions are investigated, seems to be the only really satisfactory alternative to the theory of a purposeless universe.

W. B. Selbie.

The Domain of Selfhood. By R. V. Feldman, M.A. Allen & Unwin. 10s. 6d.
The World and God. By Hubert S. Box, B.D., Ph.D. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

It seems worth while to take these two books together because of their markedly contrasted character. Both are of high quality, the work of able men of strong convictions: the interesting thing is that their convictions are so extremely opposed, while nevertheless each writer has the intention of justifying and promoting belief in God and assisting the cause of religion. Dr. Box quotes Dean Matthews as saying, "There is no modern philosophy, there are only modern philosophers"; and the two works before us serve as an excellent illustration of the thesis, so different are they both in outlook and in results.

When, however, Dr. Box says further that any attempt to present the tenets of religion in terms of modern philosophy is doomed to failure, he is saying what would provoke the most cordial disagreement on the part of Mr. Feldman. For he most emphatically believes that there is a modern philosophy *par excellence, viz.*, that of Kant and Fichte. His book is in fact a new presentation of the Fichtean theme of the Ego. There is undoubtedly a touch of genius about the work: it brings back to memory something of the original inspiration of the German Idealist movement in the early works of Fichte and Schelling before Idealism had been worked out into a *philosophie globale* by Hegel, who converted the original impulse of the movement into solid achievement.

Mr. Feldman's central idea is Self-Respect: this he takes to be the first principle of all philosophy. There are combined in it Fichte's notion of the Ego and Kant's reverence for the moral law: the self with which Mr. Feldman is concerned is not the empirical self of desire and longing, but the Universal Self which possesses authority over all that is empirical and to which all desires and longings must be subordinated. The place where Mr. Feldman differs from both Kant and Fichte is in the way in which he connects his principle of Self-Respect with God as its Ground and Reason: the authority of the Self is the authority of Divine revelation. Not in and by itself does the Self command and rule, but because it is God's viceregent: it acts for Him and is clothed with His authority. Mr. Feldman recognizes that here he is going back from Kant and Fichte to Descartes, who similarly grounded the Self in God; but Martineau also is mentioned, to receive special praise because he saw that only through such grounding of the Self in God could its authority be maintained.

The rest of the *Domain of Selfhood* is occupied with the working out of its prime principle, first in relation to the world, and then in relation to the individual. Mr. Feldman exhibits Self-Respect as a cosmic principle, a force in history and motive-power of evolution: he further shows how in the individual it "ramifies in the special virtues," to borrow a useful phrase from Bonaventura which exactly describes what the author is after in the last part of his book.

To turn from all this to Dr. Box is to pass into another world: he is convinced that all modern idealism is altogether on wrong lines and bids us, if we seek a sane and workable philosophy, return to St. Thomas Aquinas as the *maestro di coloro che sanno*. It may be recognized at once that *The World and God* contains a lucid and accurate re-statement of the main positions of the Thomist doctrine of God and of His relation to the world. Dr. Box quite rightly refers to the great change that has come over the attitude of thinking men towards medieval scholasticism and its greatest exponent; and his prescription for all the doubts and uncertainties of the present age is a thoroughgoing return to the Angelic Doctor and the *philosophia perennis* which he represents.

It may be willingly conceded that a patient study of St. Thomas will do all philosophers and all theologians good. But it seems to us that Dr. Box overstates his case. He uses St. Thomas very much as St. Thomas himself used Aristotle: in the *Summa contra Gentiles* and the *Summa Theologica* Aristotle is *philosophus*, and other thinkers are mentioned only to be corrected: just so in *The World and God* St. Thomas is always right, and everyone else—Descartes, Kant, Hegel, and the rest—wrong. In the process of reprimanding the modern idealists Dr. Box is not always fair to his opponents: it is ridiculous, *e.g.*, to represent Kant as making the necessity of universal judgments purely psychological, or to think that the *cogito ergo sum* of Descartes can be dismissed as a philosophical principle by quoting Bertrand Russell, who says that it amounts to no more than that the experience of thinking proves that there is thinking. The philosophy of St. Thomas is, in fact, used as a "big stick" with which to put down all rivals; but one is continually reminded of the proverb that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones. The merit of Thomism is its completeness as a survey of the field; but considered as a system it is full of loose joints, and its imperfection has been brought to view over and over again by the subsequent development of philosophy. It is hopeless advice to bid us to return to the thirteenth century and wash out everything that has happened since in philosophy, except only the neo-scholasticism which makes some attempt to revise the relation of St. Thomas to modern science. If Dr. Box pitched his claim for St. Thomas a little lower, bidding us study Thomism for its roundness and completeness, so as to get some sense of the width of the field to be covered by philosophy and the relation of its different parts and so not lose ourselves wholly in one-sided specialisms, then *The World and God* would be a very good and useful book. Even as it is, with all its faults it is a useful book. It supplies the same kind of corrective to the *Domain of Selfhood* and its prophetic fervour for Idealism as Mr. Feldman's book does for it. Anyone who takes the trouble to read both and weigh them one against the other will not only learn a great deal of philosophy, but, if he is not just annoyed or daunted by the absolute clash of opinions, may even come through in the end to some settled judgment about the aims and possibilities of the philosophy of Theism in our time.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

Experience and its Modes. By MICHAEL OAKESHOTT. Cambridge Press. 15s.

Anyone who can read this book from start to finish with sustained interest and intelligent comprehension of the argument must be already something of a philosopher. For there is here no concession whatever to the continual demand for a popularization of philosophy: the author requires of the reader a steady and strenuous endeavour in logical thinking. But it should be said at once that the effort, if made, will be amply rewarded.

Here is a book which covers practically the whole philosophical field, and which discusses the main and fundamental problems of philosophy in a masterly and brilliant way. If in the end it leaves us with some uneasy questions to put to Mr. Oakeshott or to ourselves, that shows the work to be in the line of the true Socratic tradition. To cause men to reflect deeply upon fundamentals is the first duty of the philosopher: if he can do something also to help towards the solution of the problems he raises, then indeed he has deserved well of his public. Mr. Oakeshott has undoubtedly succeeded in the first task: at the end of this review we shall consider how far he has succeeded in the second.

The philosophy propounded in *Experience and its Modes* is a stringent Idealism of the Bradleian type. Mr. Oakeshott says that, of all philosophers, he has learned most from Hegel and Bradley; but there can be no doubt that the influence of Bradley is dominant with him. If he is a Hegelian, he is a Bradleian Hegelian: the negative element in Bradley's philosophy, which leads him to emphasize the unsatisfactoriness of all our common forms of experience, is the governing factor in *Experience and its Modes*. There is here nothing of the Hegelian dialectic according to which every subordinate form of thought is a stage on the way to the final vision in which the Whole is completely comprehended. Mr. Oakeshott passes judgment upon various great forms of experience one by one, and the judgment is always one of condemnation: none of them gives truth or reality, none carries us a whit nearer to it.

Experience, says Mr. Oakeshott, here in agreement certainly with Hegel as well as with Bradley, is implicit thought: it is a world of ideas, in which the criterion of truth is the same as the criterion of reality. That criterion is *coherence*: there is no other test either of truth or reality. A perfectly coherent experience is what the philosopher seeks: the persistent search for it in fact is philosophy, and nothing else has any claim to the name.

Actual experience, however, presents the strange and remarkable phenomenon that men, while pursuing coherence in experience, nevertheless commonly pursue it only to a limited degree. There are *arrests* in experience. It is the task of the philosopher to exhibit these arrests, and to strive to get beyond them.

Mr. Oakeshott examines three great arrests in human experience, which produce the worlds of history, science, and practice respectively. These worlds are worlds of experience; worlds of ideas, which are coherent up to a point, but which nevertheless fail to reach that ultimate coherence, which would constitute a world of truth and reality.

What is the character of the arrest which these limited worlds suffer, and which condemns them to final impotence? They are not to be understood as *parts* of the whole and complete experience, as though each stopped short by omitting certain fundamental elements from its scope. On the contrary, each presents the whole of experience without diminution or omission; the failure is simply that the presentation is from a particular point of view.

History presents all things *sub specie præteritorum*. Mr. Oakeshott denies that causality reigns in history: it is a web of contingent events, the coherence of which consists in their necessary connexion with the evidence from which the historian works. But this evidence is present and not past: hence to represent the world *sub specie præteritorum* is inconsistent with the basis from which we act in doing so. The historian's position resembles that of the man who saws through the bough on which he sits. History is of the past and can only view things as past; yet it depends on the present which it excludes.

Science, again, views the world *sub specie quantitatis*. It aims at a world of experience absolutely communicable: it works with the principle of causality and issues in statistical generalizations, which after all can never give us the individuality we seek in the object. All so-called natural laws are hypothetical: they say what will happen, if so and so is the case. But they do not tell us what in a particular instance is the case: and here is the arrest of scientific experience, which fails at this point to reach truth and reality.

Practical experience works between a world of ideas which is given and a world of ideals in accordance with which it is to be transformed. This perpetual duality in practical experience exhibits it as in the end an unsatisfying view of things: however often we close the gap by the realization of our ideals, it breaks out again, as each achievement becomes simply the starting-point for another demand upon our endeavour.

What, then, of the final world of experience, absolutely coherent, which alone is truth and reality? If neither history, nor science, nor practice can reach it, can philosophy do so? As far as I understand Mr. Oakeshott's answer, it is that of the *via negativa*. What is Truth and Reality? It is *not* any of the unsatisfactory and illusory worlds which we mistake for it. What, then, is it? We are told that philosophy is an escape from life. It would seem that we come nearest to Truth and Reality in the pursuit of the coherence we can never attain. To criticize the imperfect and illusory forms of experience is the highest wisdom: it is the only form in which truth and reality become ours.

This is the result to which the single-minded pursuit of the principle of coherence is supposed to lead us. The question in the end is whether the result itself is satisfactory. It seems to me that it is so unsatisfactory that we must again do what Mr. Oakeshott is always bidding us do: we must criticize the first principle of the mode of experience we are studying. This mode of experience, whose content is altogether negative, in so far as it resembles nothing we commonly know, is reached by pursuing solely the principle of coherence. Have we not thereby reached an arrest in experience? Surely it must be so, when we reach a form of experience about which all that can be said is that it is an escape from life.

Coherence can never be the only criterion of Truth and Reality. Like the "laws" of science, it is an abstract principle; and we ask in the end, Coherence of what particulars? There is a given element in experience, which supplies concreteness to the principle of coherence. Our business in philosophy is to find out what coheres. There is no other place to which we can look for the positive elements which are to be combined by the principle of coherence than in the common forms of experience which we enjoy. They must each in its own way contribute to the final result, which certainly we can never do more than sketch out in outline.

Perhaps at this point a mathematical illustration may help. There are many great and small circles that can be drawn on the surface of a sphere, no two of which occupy the same plane. But if we are given the position of a sufficient number of these circles in space, we can fill in the sphere to which they belong. Experience may be compared to the whole sphere and its different modes, historical, scientific, practical, and others, to the various circles which, though they are in different planes, yet belong to the same sphere. If I may be allowed to refer to my own small book, *The Metaphysical Justification of Religion*, that was an attempt to show how scientific, practical, æsthetic, and religious experience might be combined through a metaphysic which found a place for them all. Something of this

kind appears to me to be necessary : historical experience, of course, must also have its place : it is a merit of Mr. Oakeshott's book to have called attention to its importance.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

A New Highway towards Christian Reality. By T. WIGLEY, M.A. Allen & Unwin. 8s. 6d.

Mr. Wigley writes not for technical students of philosophy or theology, but for educated people in general who are distressed by the conflict between traditional religious beliefs and the current scientific doctrines of our time. The book might have as an alternative title, *The Profession of Faith of a Modernist.* Mr. Wigley sees quite rightly that the way of many thoughtful people into the Church is barred by intellectual difficulties; and he is trying, as one who has found a road for himself, to make the same path passable for others. His purpose is that of the Hebrew prophet, to cast up a highway and gather out the stones : that is, he will remove difficulties and prepare the ground for a reasonable interpretation of Christianity. He assails the Deistic conception of God with its counterpart in the view of Nature as a mechanism abandoned to itself, and he asserts the immanence of God in the world by the help of a doctrine of emergent evolution. At the same time God is not lost in His immanence, but is also transcendent. He is the Creator of the world, Who provides for human freedom by His own self-limitation : in fact, all creation, and not merely that of man, involves the self-limitation of God, inasmuch as it allows a relative independence to the world.

Jesus is construed as the supreme religious personality who was the consummation of humanity and the manifestation of deity. He reveals to us the love of God : His sacrifice is the earthly revelation of God's own sacrifice. Salvation consists in that transformation of character which takes place when the Love of God manifested in Jesus awakes an answering love in us.

Faith and knowledge are not opposed. All knowledge begins with faith and consists in the progressive rationalization of this primitive faith.

This is the merest sketch of a full book, which contains a great deal of careful thought and reflection as well as the evidence of much reading. What is to be said as to the result? All those who desire equally earnestly with Mr. Wigley that there should be a recovery of faith through the removal of its present difficulties, must wish well to his enterprise. More than that, the book will in all probability be a real help to some of those for whom it is especially intended. It is marked by candour and conviction, and will certainly remove some difficulties out of the way of the educated man or woman vexed with the modern religious problem; granted that he or she will give the book a careful reading. It will be made clear to such that modern science is inclined to admit and even require a spiritual interpretation of the universe, in a way that the science of the nineteenth century was not. But when Mr. Wigley speaks of a broad highway from science to God he goes too far. All that the science and philosophy of to-day offer us is *steps* through the mire of modern perplexity. The present intellectual chaos is like Bunyan's Slough of Despond, which could receive into itself whole cartloads of wholesome instructions, and yet be the Slough of Despond still. All that our present-day leaders in the direction of a spiritual view of the universe are able to do is to make it clear that materialism is unsatisfactory; but a really convincing and comprehensive spiritual philosophy which masters all the difficulties there is not yet. It is a case of steps, not a continuous road : we may well be thankful for the steps, but we have to be very careful in crossing from one to another.

That this is the case is proved indirectly by Mr. Wigley himself. His method is to support himself by quotations from modern scientists and philosophers, Jeans, Eddington, Bergson, Lloyd Morgan, Inge, D'Arcy, and so on. But the agreement of these authorities is only quite general; if we were to pursue further with them we should find disagreement. Mr. Wigley's book would have been clearer if there had been less quotation: there is a very great deal. No doubt the reason for it is psychological: it is the idea that the particular readers in view will pay more attention to Jeans and Eddington and the rest than to the unaided Christian apologist. But the argument would come out more clearly and with more strength if it were all stated from the single point of view of the author. Incidentally, of course, the gaps in it would be more evident; but that would not matter, as the firm points would be more definite.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

Kant. By A. D. LINDSAY. Benn. 12s. 6d.

This new study of the great philosopher marks the change that has come over British philosophy during the present century. A generation or more ago the interpretation of Kant in the British universities was Hegelian. T. H. Green and Edward Caird were the leading exponents of Kant; but in their hands Kant was treated simply as the half-way house to Hegel. Green and Caird especially valued Kant's philosophy as a means of combating the traditional British associationist doctrines, which deriving from Hume had reached the zenith of their influence in the philosophy of John Stuart Mill. Kant was interpreted as an improved Berkeley: it was maintained by Green and Caird that the genial Bishop of Cloyne might have anticipated the sage of Königsberg, if only instead of saying *"Esse est percipi"* he had said *"Esse est intelligi."*

Kant's doctrine of the synthetic activity of the mind was used for the criticism of Hume's atomism, which was the fundamental assumption of the reigning British associationist philosophy. Kant was supposed to hold with and after Hume that the given element in knowledge was a mere chaos of unrelated sense-data, everything else being the contribution of the mind. The next step was to say with Hegel that even this last empirical residuum in knowledge could and must finally become transparent through the mind's further action, and so reveal all things in heaven and earth as in one way or other the product of universal mind. This was epistemological idealism: it was widely accepted and generally recognized by British philosophers: only since the beginning of the new century did doubt of the position begin to make serious inroads upon its strongholds in the universities. First, in the opening decade of this century before the Great War, came Pragmatism with its doctrine that Truth is what works; then, in the years since the war we have had the New Realism which asserts strongly the independence of the object of knowledge and the mere "togetherness" of matter and mind. Each of these movements has turned to Kant, discovering elements in his philosophy that Green and Caird had ignored. The time was ripe for a revised estimate of the great philosopher: the way has been led in Great Britain by the massive commentary of Professor Norman Kemp Smith upon the *Critique of Pure Reason.* Utilizing in part previous German work, Kemp Smith showed the presence in Kant's chief work of sections emanating from different stages of his philosophical development, and contradicting one another in important points: in the end there emerged from such critical discussions a new exposition of Kant's theoretical philosophy as phenomenalism, or the doctrine simply of the empirical object of knowledge.

It is along this line, though with some important differences in detail, that the Master of Balliol proceeds in his new book; but he is interested, not so much in Kant's theoretical philosophy alone, as in his total view. His aim is to show that for the main purport of what Kant has to say the dispute between epistemological idealism and realism is irrelevant. Kant was in the field of theory simply a phenomenalist; but his true interest goes altogether beyond the sphere of the phenomenon. He interprets reality, not in terms of our knowledge of it, but of our action upon it. He abandons dogmatic metaphysics, because he finds, in its straining towards an ideal of knowledge never actually to be reached in practice, no answer to the questions in which his true interest lies. He propounds a new way to metaphysical knowledge through moral action, in which the fundamental questions which really concern him find their solution. These questions are precisely what Varisco has called "The Great Problems": they are nothing less than the immortality of the soul, the freedom of the will, and the existence of God. Only a practical answer to such questions is possible; but Kant is sure that he has found this answer. It is in this that the real greatness of Kant's philosophy consists. He valued science, and in his phenomenology surveyed its field as none had done before him; but in the end he pointed beyond it to the land of moral freedom with its great religious implicates.

The Master of Balliol's *Kant* is a notable contribution to the present-day study of a noble philosophy, because in its three hundred pages it covers the whole ground of the great *Critiques* with the accompaniment of a most careful and exact exposition, which shrinks from no difficulties and goes into the closest detail, yet continually with a comprehensive grasp of the whole which is being expounded. The book is not easy reading: no genuine exposition of Kant can be so. But it is a veritable "companion to Kant": nothing better can be desired for the student who is trying to grasp the significance of Kantianism both in detail and as a whole. In particular, the exposition of that most difficult of all Kantian themes, the deduction of the Categories, is most masterly: so also is that of the introduction to the Critique of Judgment, in which, together with its discarded original form entitled "On Philosophy in General," Kant more completely than anywhere else summed up his philosophy as a whole.

In conclusion, it may be said that a good general knowledge of Kantianism can be gained by studying this one book; but it is to be hoped that such study will whet the appetite for more of the same, and drive the reader back upon Kant himself.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The History of the Decline and Fall of the Medieval Papacy. By L. ELLIOTT BINNS. Methuen. 16s.

Dr. Binns invites the most severe examination of his book by saying outright in the preface, as well as by implication in the form of the title, that

> my volume is therefore to be regarded definitely as a supplement to *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, and, in particular, of its final volume, where the treatment is inclined to be hurried and superficial, and where a number of small errors occur, which even Bury's comprehensive learning has failed to eliminate.

Without venturing into the deep waters presented by this comparison we may say at once emphatically that Dr. Binns has written an extremely useful book, full of shrewd and impartial judgments. The outstanding feature of it is the smooth and pleasant way in which it is written. The long story is never confusing, and even the idle reader is reluctant to put the

book down. The ease and comfort with which Dr. Binns writes and his readers read form indeed at times a pitfall; for these qualities make him on occasion rather diffuse and wandering, whilst they lull the reader into fancying that he is getting more information than in fact he is getting. This is not to say that Dr. Binns is not master of a concise and pregnant style when he is disposed to write tersely. There is more than a reminder of Gibbon in the balance of some of his antitheses. He is occasionally careless in the construction of a sentence, and is not above using an expression like "on a par with." These are, however, the carelessnesses of an easy writer, not the crudities of a tyro.

The size of Dr. Binns's book and the scope of the subject do not allow opportunity for much more than an outline; and scholars will not find here many things with which they are not already familiar. But we know of no book where the main facts about the development of the papal monarchy and the connexion of these facts with the secular history of Europe are so easily accessible and made so intelligible as they are here. After a brief sketch of the growth of papal power before the reign of Innocent III, Dr. Binns settles down to a fuller treatment of his subject with Frederick II, and thenceforward traces the history of the Popes to the Sack of Rome. Many of the portraits are most happily and vigorously drawn. In particular, the treatment of the Renaissance Popes, of fifteenth century Italian politics, and of the Renaissance and Reformation in northern Europe, impresses us. It is difficult in so small a space not to be trite, boring, and confusing at once: Dr. Binns is unobtrusively successful in this searching ordeal.

Everybody who has to tell so long a story must choose his own main lines, and nobody's choice will completely satisfy other people. After making allowance for this we feel, nevertheless, that Dr. Binns has too readily accepted certain conventional formulae about the general development of European civilization in the Middle Ages. He presents the struggle of the Empire and the Papacy as if it were a more complete and dominating clue to the central period than we think (despite the intoxicating genius of Bryce) it was. This makes it possible for him to write such a sentence as "The Churchman was practical and followed practical aims; the imperialist was idealistic and followed ideal aims." That there is a truth in this antithesis we admit, but the phrase needs so much glossing as to be almost misleading without it. Dr. Binns seems to us too "western" in his outlook, and consequently does less than justice to the practical wisdom of the Crusaders and to the permanent value of their work. This same outlook makes him deficient in sympathy with the Greeks, and enables him to say things about "nationalism" in the Middle Ages which may lead beginners astray. The unwary may easily picture the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as merely a process of "putting on time" till the appearance of modern Europe, though that is a view of them which (we are sure Dr. Binns will agree with us) the men who lived in those centuries did not take of their own activities. But these are small defects, inevitable in any general treatment which calls for generalization. The tendency to drop into moralization might, however, be curbed without loss.

We end with three examples of the quiet caustic humour which enriches and sharpens the flavour of the whole book. Here is a phrase from the account of the negotiations between the Hussites and the Council of Basle:

> Their representatives had arrived at Basle at the end of 1432, and as a concession to their puritan prejudices the streets had been cleared of prostitutes.

Here is a word about Porcaro, a conspirator against the rule of Nicholas V:

> Actually he came of a middle-class family; but conspirators seem never satisfied with the social standing with which nature has provided them, and so he announced that he was descended from the Scipios.

Here is a glimpse of Innocent VIII :

> Innocent, in his way, was also a pioneer; he was the first Pope openly to acknowledge his children.

B. L. MANNING.

SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST.

(*Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading*).

For 12 years this descriptive list of books has been published quarter by quarter. It entails a great amount of work, and it is only reiterated assurances from all parts of the world, especially from ministerial readers, that induce us to continue it. We have sometimes attempted to classify the books, but rigid classification proves impossible : "Bible" merges into "Theology," "History" into "Biography," "Psychology" into "Sociology." Generally, however, there is a rough classification, beginning with "Bible" and "Theology" through a flexible scheme of classification to "Fiction" at the end.

The new volume of the "Books of the Old Testament in Colloquial Speech" is *Micah and Habakkuk* (N.A.S.U., 9d.), Dr. J. P. Naish translating *Micah* and Dr. R. B. Y. Scott *Habakkuk*.

The late Prof. J. H. Ropes was best known in this country for his work as editor of the *Harvard Theological Review*. His four lectures, now published as *The Synoptic Gospels* (Harvard & Oxford Presses, 6s. 6d.), are eminently readable, and Prof. Ropes does not hesitate to break away from commonly accepted views. *Mark* is not biography or history, but theology, the answering of the problem, "Why did the Messiah die?", and it is the work of an educated man. *Matthew,* not written by the Apostle (else it would not be so dependent on *Mark*), is a systematic compendium for the instruction of Christians. *Luke is* a biography, the first volume of a comprehensive history and a work of literary art, from the companion of Paul. Prof. Ropes is very dubious about " Q," and seems to favour the idea that *Luke* depended on *Matt.* rather than that *Matt.* and *Luke* both drew on " Q."

We give a cordial welcome to M. Edmond Fleg's *Jesus* (Gollancz, 10s. 6d.) admirably translated into English. Nothing but good can come of these reconstructions of the life of Jesus, fantastic as some of them are in their chronology and their manipulation of evidence. The paralytic, healed by Jesus and greatly attracted by Him, is the youth who flees from the garden leaving his cloak behind him, who refuses to carry the Cross of Jesus, and is therefore condemned to walk for ever—the Wandering Jew. He it is who narrates the life of Jesus to M. Fleg, who shows his wide acquaintance with Rabbinic and other lore and his gift of vivid description (the story of the scourging and the crucifixion is horrible indeed.) There is a good deal of rationalizing, and M. Fleg never forgets that he is a Jew :

> But he, the Son of God, how long did he endure on his cross? Six hours, six long hours! . . . . But the sons of Israel on either side of him have been nailed to their crosses in his name for nearly twenty centuries—nor will they be taken down to-morrow!

At times, too, he waxes satirical with great effect, as when he pictures Jesus and the modern hypocrites who pay lip service to disarmament :

> The French delegate has proved that one army will be sufficient to make peace; the German delegate requires at least ten, provided they are German armies. The Soviet delegate has declared that a gun is only a gun when it is used against the proletariat; the English delegate that a shell only kills when it kills on land, it never kills when it kills at sea. America has claimed: "No one will ever disarm the nations except by selling them arms." Italy: "We only prepare for war because of its beauty—we would never really make war, even if it were necessary." Lastly come Japan: "War is only war when you call it war; you can do exactly the same thing if you call it peace."

Dr. A. W. Harrison's **All That Jesus Began* (S.C.M., 2s.) is an admirable book for study circles. Its sub-title, "The Social Outcome of Christianity," indicates its range better than the title. Each chapter is provided with questions and suggested reading: a group of Christians working through the book would find the process invigorating. Tyndale for Tyndall on p. 138.

Mr. H. V. Morton has such a great following—and not undeservedly—that his *In the Steps of the Master* (Rich & Cowan, 7s. 6d.) is sure to be in great demand for Christmas presents. Nevertheless, we cannot feel it is as successful as its predecessors—scholars will prefer Sir George Adam Smith's *Historical Geography,* and preachers and commentators find what they need elsewhere unencumbered by Mr. Morton's popularization. This is not to say that the book does not contain much of great interest, but it is to the casual reader that the hotch-potch of history and geography, ancient and modern, will appeal most. Perhaps the best things are the description of a visit to Petra, and the account of Mr. Morton's attempt to save a dying dog.

Not the least interesting section of Mr. H. G. Wood's Hulsean Lectures, *Christianity and the Nature of History* (Cambridge Press, 6s.), is the biographical preface, which describes the way his home life, his education at Cambridge, and his reading, led him to the conviction that he must reckon with Jesus as a factor in history. The gist of the Lectures themselves may perhaps be found in Gerhard Kittel's words:

> The Jesus of history is valueless and unintelligible unless He be experienced and confessed by faith as the living Christ. But if we would be true to the *N.T.* we must at once reverse this judgment. The Christ of faith has no existence, is mere noise and smoke, apart from the reality of the Jesus of history.

The titles of the lectures will suggest Mr. Wood's approach to this conclusion: "Christianity and the Nature of History;" "Great Men and Social Forces in History;" "The Guiding Hand of God in History;" "The Prophetic Interpretation of History;" "Christianity and Progress;" "The Religion of Time and the Religion of Eternity." Mr. Wood has read widely and writes well; many will be grateful for his book.

The time has certainly come when the contribution of Von Hügel to theology should be measured, but we do not hesitate to confess that we turned first in Dr. A. H. Dakin's *Von Hügel and the Supernatural* (S.P.C.K., 12s.) to the half-dozen letters to G. E. Newsom—to be immediately rewarded by a reference to "my much-loved Troeltsch"—and then to the bibliography. Dr. Dakin is an American scholar, and his volume prepares the way for a final estimate of one of the most profound theologians of our day, though it scarcely supplies that estimate. Under the headings "Epistemology," "Intimations of the Supernatural," "Religion," "Mysticism," "Doctrines about God," and "Doctrines about Man," Dr. Dakin gathers together Von Hügel's teaching, and to follow him through is a stimulating exercise, as wrestling with Von Hügel invariably is.

It is a pleasure to read Mr. Alfred Noyes's **The Unknown God* (Sheed & Ward, 7s. 6d.), not only for the style in which it is written, but for its sincerity and candour. Mr. Noyes traces his pilgrimage from agnosticism to theism and Christianity, a pilgrimage which has lasted from his youth until the present day. Darwin, Huxley, Haeckel, Clifford; Whitehead, Barnes, Jeans; Swinburne, Tennyson, Browning; all these play their part as Mr. Noyes works his way to a Christian philosophy. The narrative, in which the personal element does not obtrude, is in itself a sketch of the development of the religious thought of the period; it is lit up by fine passages, of which the pages which describe what the world would have lost had there been no Christianity are an outstanding example: the result is a helpful and convincing book.

Mr. Algar Thorold has published a new translation of *The Spiritual Letters of Father P. J. de Caussade* (Burns Oates, 6s.). These letters on "the practice of self-abandonment to Divine Providence" were written by the French Jesuit to cloistered women in the first half of the 18th century. Protestant readers will desire an Introduction and Notes, and will wonder how far concentration on the cultivation of one's own spiritual life can go and still remain healthy.

Perhaps the American Church historian who has contributed most to learning during the last half-century is Dr. A. C. McGiffert, though possibly Williston Walker shares this distinction with him. Until the end Dr. McGiffert continued to guide students—the two volumes of his *History of Christian Thought* are fresh in our minds—and we are glad that now his son has collected the papers in **Christianity as History and Faith* (Scribners, 7s. 6d.), in some of which we see a little more of the writer than we do in the more objective histories. Prof. McGiffert has selected the papers with the deliberate intention of presenting "the major emphasis and the unified character" of his father's theology. The wide range of the selection makes it impossible to review the volume adequately in a short notice: we can merely commend it as warmly as we welcome it, and draw the attention of readers to the extract on page 102 of this journal.

The Bishop of Croydon's *What is this Christianity?* (Hodder, 3s. 6d.) is a sequel to his brother's *What is God Like?* It has all the characteristics of Mr. Wood's previous books, and will be found useful along the same lines. The Bishop does not go very deep, and makes no original contribution—it is significant that many of his authorities are quoted at second hand, Henry Vaughan *via* Muriel Lester and John Buchan *via Public Opinion*—but he is an expert "popularizer," and can adapt what he has to say to catch young people and non-technical readers. For such his book will be particularly helpful and refreshing.

The Earl of Lytton has the highest opinion of the life and teaching of the late Homer Lane, and his *New Treasure* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.) is an exposition of Lane's teaching—"a study of the psychology of love." Lane was greatly influenced by Freud, and his view of sin is reminiscent of that set forth in Dr. R. J. Campbell's *New Theology*. We are, however, by no means as impressed with the cases quoted by Lord Lytton as he himself is. Lord Lytton believes that the fundamental mistake made by the Churches is that of putting orthodoxy before truth, authority before sincerity, the death of Christ before His life and teaching, and substituting morality for love in teaching the young about the nature of God. He contrasts

> the sweet, warm, loving sentiment of the Lord's Prayer with the cold intellectual dogma of the Apostles' Creed.

The book shows the re-emergence of an attitude to religion which has not been uncommon in the Church's history. It attracts by its earnestness and sincerity.

Volumes of prayers continue to come from the press. The latest selection is one made by the Rev. H. G. Tunnicliff (Nicholson & Watson, 5s. & 3s. 6d.). We only have to compare some of the modern prayers, such as those of Dr. Orchard and Mr. Weatherhead, with the classical prayers to see how far we fall short.

It is rarely that sermons are specially commended in these pages, but preachers could get nothing but good from two volumes which come from American preachers, Dr. Fosdick's *The Secret of Victorious Living* (S.C.M., 6s.) and Dr. Douglas Horton's *Taking a City* (Harper, $1.00). The day of the pulpit will never be over while there is virile preaching like this, in which eternal truths are constantly applied to modern problems by consecrated personalities. One of the 25 sermons in Dr. Fosdick's volume is that on the unknown soldier. Dr. Horton has ten sermons only, but they all throb with life.

From the day when, beginning our ministry, we heard Dr. J. A. Hutton preach, and heard him say in conversation that it was his invariable rule to stand to read the newspaper each morning lest the perusal should occupy more than ten minutes, we have always looked up to Dr. Hutton as a preacher. Indeed, we are heretical enough to believe that the Church of Christ did not gain when Dr. Hutton exchanged the pastorate for the editor's chair. He is a preacher with "flashes" in his exposition, and often by a phrase or an illustration lights up puzzling passages and stretches a hand to needy souls. Most of *Finally* (Hodder, 7s. 6d.)—there are five other papers at the end of the volume—consists of a study of Paul, with *Phil.* 4^8 as corner-stone. All who have been inspired by Dr. Hutton's preaching will be glad he has found time for this book.

Ministers who find it difficult to be fresh in presentation of the Christmas message may find assistance in the Rev. J. Alick Bouquet's happy little book, *The Spirit of Christmas* (Longmans, 3s. 6d.).

The Adult School Union Handbook for 1935 is entitled *Paths to Freedom* (N.A.S.U., 2s. 6d. & 1s. 6d.). Once more it covers a wide range effectively, bringing in not only the teaching of Jesus, but Greece and Rome, China and India, Shakespeare's *Julius Cæsar,* Bach, and Cromwell!

Canon R. C. Joynt's *The Church's Real Work* (Longmans, 2s. 6d.) is written for "clergy and laity," but it has its message for those outside the Church of England, and especially for ministers. About pastoral visitation, personal dealing, the influence of the devoted life, and the need for renewing the soul in the secret place—on these and many other subjects Canon Joynt gives advice needed in all the Churches.

Beyond the bare facts that Loisy and Tyrrell, Baron von Hügel and Miss Petre, were its protagonists, English Protestants know little about *The Modernist Movement in the Roman Church* (Cambridge Press, 12s. 6d.) and they will welcome the Rev. A. R. Vidler's Norrisian Prize Essay. Sometimes they will scarcely be able to discern the wood for the trees, but in general they will find the survey informing and useful. Mr. Vidler does well to bring out Duchesne's shrinking from modernism and to emphasize that Roman Catholic modernism, as represented by Loisy, was not derived from the Liberal Protestantism of Harnack and Sabatier, but a reply to it. He also insists on its complete defeat, not merely accepting Loisy's dictum, "Modernism as a party of open resistance to the Roman

absolutism passed away with Tyrrell," but claiming that it had little effect outside the Roman Church.

Canon Major's *The Roman Church and the Modern Man* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 5s.) deals faithfully with the Papal claims to infallibility and supremacy, and then describes Rome's attitude to internationalism, race, and politics. Chapters are also included on " The Roman Cultus," " The Lure of Rome" and "Doctrinal Accretions". Canon Major seems unduly impressed by accessions to Rome : he forgets that Rome says nothing of her losses.

Prof. Anders Nygren's * *The Church Controversy in Germany* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.) was published on 21st September, too late for notice in our last issue. Much water has flowed under the bridge since then, but the Swedish theologian has provided the clearest and most concise account of the troubles in the Evangelical Church in Germany which we have seen. A continuation bringing the book up to date would be welcome. Prof. Nygren sees in the controversy not merely a fight for the liberty of the Church against the State, but a fight for Christianity itself.

The Roman Confessional and the psycho-analyst's consulting-room testify to the craving of mankind for guidance and help, and no minister of religion who gives himself conscientiously to his job but realizes the great opportunity presented to the Church by the hundreds of people perplexed by the changing standards and conventions of the times. Mr. Havelock Ellis's *My Confessional* (Lane, 7s. 6d.) shows how those outside the Church seek help from a well-known writer : it discusses some seventy problems, of the most varied kind, practically all of them raised by correspondents, known and unknown.

Prof. J. B. S. Haldane's *Fact and Faith* (Watts, 1s.) reprints sundry articles from periodicals with a provocative Preface which shows how far from the scientific temper a scientist can travel. Nevertheless there is much in the Preface that is disturbing. Prof. Haldane is certainly within his rights, for example, in asking why a church should not be rated and taxed on the same scale as his laboratory :

> If people want religious services, they should be prepared to pay for them as they do for scientific lectures.

We cannot help feeling that the outstanding characteristic of Count Hermann Keyserling's *Problems of Personal Life* (Cape, 7s. 6d.), now translated from the French, is its supreme egotism. The book contains a great deal of pontifical verbiage, and its ponderous platitudes and misleading generalizations have the air of an oracle from Heaven. Whether he speaks of North or South America, Italy or France, Germany or Great Britain, Count Keyserling has no doubt he speaks with authority. In a discussion that surveys "Health", "Property", "Family Life", "Marriage", "Progress", "Creativeness", and "Reason and Religion" there are without doubt some good things, and it is well to be reminded that

> It is impossible to experience strong emotions without increasing life's fundamental instability,

but what are we to say when we are told that

> Sexual questions have no spiritual importance whatsoever,

and that (with all the emphasis of italics)

> The truth of the matter is this; *of all fetishes law, considered as the 'ipso facto' incarnation of justice, is the least noble.*

and that

> Without a doubt, Jesus took a personal stand against the family. He was all for congregations.

Count Keyserling desires this book to be an introduction to his previous books. We fear he will be disappointed.

In *Their Religion* (Hodder, 5s.) Mr. A. J. Russell sets out to tell how some of the world's greatest men answered the questions of religion. They are Lincoln, Burns, Foch, Gladstone, Napoleon, Disraeli, Nelson, Dickens, Washington, Livingstone, Cromwell, Darwin, and Shakespeare, and then there is a concluding chapter on Jesus. The list of names will suggest that Mr. Russell is an adept at making bricks without straw!

Mr. Charles Williams's *James I* (Barker, 10s.) is a competent biography in the Strachey style. Mr. Williams sees in James, the King, the comic King, and the sinister King, and his estimate shows these intermingled strands. James's letters are skilfully interwoven into a narrative which carries the reader along. If at times there is a straining after epigrammatic style, at others there are suggestive sentences:

> It (the Church of England) is called a *via media;* it is about as much like a *via media* as Elizabeth herself, unless the true meaning of the *via media* is that it contains both the extremer ways at once. The Church of England, incredibly Catholic and impossibly Protestant, is not unlike the Queen, who was incredibly royal and impossibly *vulgar*—in the original sense of the word. Something in the genius of our nature combines opposites.

Despite the occasional recurrence of the affectation of its title we have enjoyed reading Mr. Osbert Burdett's *The Rev. Smith, Sydney* (Chapman & Hall, 15s.). To Mr. Burdett Smith is the born journalist but also a sincere and active Christian, thoroughly healthy, thoroughly alive. Dugald Stewart said his preaching in Edinburgh gave him "a thrilling sense of sublimity never before awakened by any other oratory", while his lectures delighted as much as his wit in private conversation. Mr. Burdett gives useful summaries and estimates of the lectures and of *Peter Plymley's Letters,* and makes their author live as he describes his life at Foston or Combe Florey. A good bit of work.

Mr. H. K. Olphin made a good choice of subject for his M.A. thesis, for his *George Tierney* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.) fills a real gap. Pitt, Fox, and Sheridan have overshadowed a man who for forty years played a prominent part in British politics, one of the competent second-class men who have not the qualities of leadership. Tierney had a clever tongue, and was an able financier, and he rose to place, though not to power—for though leader of the Whigs in the Commons for a time and a member of the Government on occasions, he never had much power—without the aids of birth and wealth usually necessary. Mr. Olphin tells his story well, with the help of MSS he has unearthed. He cannot make his subject into a hero—Tierney's indecision and irresolution of purpose prevent that—but he lets us see the part he played in public life. He says little of his private life, and plunges him *in medias res* from almost the first page.

Dr. J. S. Simon was 84 when he began to write *John Wesley: the Last Phase* (Epworth Press, 18s.), the fifth and final volume of his great work on John Wesley. He lived to write most of the volume, which has been concluded by his son-in-law, Dr. A. W. Harrison. Mrs. Harrison prefixes an admirable sketch of the life and work of her father, in whom we can see Methodism at its best. This volume, like the four which preceded it, shows that Dr. Simon not only mastered the detailed history, but lived in and reproduced the very atmosphere of the early years of Methodism. The whole work is a fitting memorial.

We cannot quite see the purpose of Dr. W. J. Sparrow Simpson's *John Wesley and the Church of England* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.). Apparently he set out to show how much Wesley had in common with the Anglo-Catholics, but later he has to recognize that Wesley's teaching was full of inconsistencies. And some of his illustrations are unfortunate indeed. Thus he quotes Wesley's view of confession:

> We grant confession to men to be in many cases of use; public, in case of public scandal; private, to a spiritual guide for disturbances of the conscience, and as a help to repentance. But to make auricular confession, or particular confession to a Priest, necessary to forgiveness and salvation, when God has not so made it, is apparently to teach for doctrine the commandment of men; and to make it necessary in all cases, is to make, of what may be a useful means, a dangerous snare, both to the confessor, and those that confess.

Dr. Sparrow Simpson holds that here Wesley

> is manifestly controlled by the directions in the Book of Common Prayer and differs completely from the popular estimates of Nonconformity.

On the contrary, we can imagine no words that better express the view of confession held by most Congregationalists.

The Rev. J. O. Dobson's *Ronald Ross* (S.C.M., 3s. 6d.) tells once again the story of the conquest of malaria and yellow fever. It is a thrilling account, not merely of skill in research, but of patient endurance and arduous toil. Mr. Dobson deals adequately with the medical side of Ross's work, but he has let that overshadow the rest of Ross's many-sided life—his poems and his novels are too little known.

Mr. Humbert Wolfe's *Portraits by Inference* (Methuen, 6s.) consists of entertaining sketches of men at Oxford, in the Ministry of Munitions and other branches of the public service, and in the world of letters. Flecker, Arnold Bennett, and George Moore, Mr. Lloyd George and Lord Curzon, H. B. Irving and Gordon Craig, are all portrayed as in black and white. Mr. Wolfe has recaptured the spirit of undergraduate days remarkably well, but perhaps the finest thing in his book is his tribute to E. S. Montagu.

Politicus's *Viscount Grey of Fallodon* (Methuen, 6s.) is a picture of Grey the man, lover of nature and of peace, and an exposition of his foreign policy. Satisfying as a defence against Mr. Lloyd George, it yet leaves many questions unanswered—and it breaks off abruptly in 1914.

A Woman Who Laughed (R.T.S., 2s. 6d.) tells the story of Henrietta Soltau, one "who laughed at impossibilities and cried: 'It shall be done' ". Brought up in a strict Plymouth Brethren home, Henrietta Soltau became head of the Women Candidates' Department of the China Inland Mission, where she did a truly remarkable work. Her principles were those of George Müller in the management of his orphanages, and the book is filled with examples of timely contributions when resources were all but exhausted.

The names of Miss Mildred Cable and the sisters French have taken a high place in the ranks of Christian missionaries. They seem like old friends, and it is good to be with them again in the letters from Central Asia printed in *A Desert Journal* (Constable, 7s. 6d.). With sublime faith and splendid courage these ladies face terrific hardships in their journeys to tell the good news in Christ Jesus, and their plain and straightforward narrative should inspire many to follow in their steps.

Miss Daphne Du Maurier's *Gerald: A Portrait* (Gollancz, 10s. 6d.) is a very fine achievement. Rarely can a daughter have seen her father so objectively, and even more rarely can she have transferred so clearly into

print what she has seen. It is patent, however, that Miss Du Maurier possesses remarkable gifts in this direction, for she makes us see her grandparents and others in clear outline as well as her father. Gerald Du Maurier was a spoilt child, in every sense of the term—spoilt by his mother (the youngest child in the family), spoilt by his women-folk, in his family and out of it (what a pity he had no sons !), and spoilt by fortune. Had he had to work hard in youth, life would have been different; had he had any religious belief it would have been transformed: as it was, it was never integrated; he was never content, never serenely happy; he could forget himself for a time in work or play, but then the discontent and *malaise* returned, and in bustle and activity he sought to forget once more. Miss Du Maurier shows us all this in the striking sketch she has given us.

> All his tears and his bitterness could not bring them back. He had no faith and no belief. He knew they were dust, and he would never see them again, and he put them from him and plunged into his own life that seemed so futile sometimes, so very un-worth-while, good only for the very work it entailed, giving him some sense of achievement, however paltry, however small. And Gerald, whose very soul cried out for a goal in life and an ultimate purpose, was still without his creed and without his leader.

When we were very young Sunday School prizes and Sunday School Libraries overflowed with Annie S. Swan. *The People's Friend* in Scotland, *The British Weekly* and *Annie S. Swan's Magazine* in England made her name known far and wide. Now, in *My Life* (Nicholson & Watson, 5s.), she has written her autobiography, in which she has drawn on a full career—youth in Scotland, married life in London and Hertford, war work in England, France, and the United States, and a pen busily employed all the time. She is of a happy-go-lucky temperament, able to write in the evening of her days "I regret nothing". Mrs. Burnett Smith has met many people in all ranks of society, and she chats gaily about them all, telling many good stories. One of the best is a characteristic dictum of Robertson Nicoll, who at a party given by "a hundred distinguished women" to "a hundred distinguished men" said only one of them would be remembered in a hundred years—Thomas Hardy. We wish Mrs. Burnett Smith had not been so sparing in her dates.

In *Vale* (Longmans, 3s. 6d.) Dean Inge looks back on his long and full life and gives his impressions of past, present, and future—and a valuable survey it is, coming as it does from a well-stored and incisive mind. Had Dean Inge ever had the tiniest contact with the working classes his outlook would have been different—some things he has never seen in perspective—but no man can have everything, and we should be ingrates did we not recognize the great service he has rendered to Christianity and to learning. The beautiful tribute to his home life—he counts domestic happiness as the greatest of all goods—which concludes the book is not the least important of his counsel the new generation needs to ponder, and we trust that generation will value the final word of all :

> The Greeks had a proverb: "The works of the young, the counsels of the middle-aged, the prayers of the old." Perhaps the counsels of the old, and their predictions, are not of much value. But our prayers may not be useless. These, at any rate, we may humbly offer up, with faith and hope that the God who has kept us from our youth up until now will be with our children and grandchildren on the unknown path which they must tread. For "we have not passed this way heretofore."

A pleasantly written autobiography is Bishop W. S. Swayne's *Parson's Pleasure* (Blackwood, 7s. 6d.), which in some ways is a microcosm of the Anglican Church in the last 70 years. Born in a clergyman's home in the New Forest, the Bishop has been within the bosom of the Church all his

life; he has laboured in the countryside, in Walsall, in a West End parish, as Dean of Manchester, and as Bishop of Lincoln, with an interlude as chaplain in the South African War. Sturdy common sense has marked the whole of his long career, in which is reflected both the strength and the weakness of the Anglican system. His acute comments on patronage and the decay of the evangelizing and witnessing temper are especially worthy of consideration. There is a misprint on p. 221.

I, James Whittaker (Rich & Cowan, 7s. 6d.) is the product of a cinema age. Everything is high lights and deep shadows: it would be revealing to count the number of times the word "hellish" occurs in the book. James Whittaker was born in an Edinburgh slum in 1906. His childhood was one long fight with poverty in that city, on a windswept island, and in Liverpool: its crowded horrors are relieved only by the marvellous courage of his mother. Finally he settled down in Rochdale and became a cotton operative—when not unemployed, in the Army, or doing some temporary job—married, and had a child. He dabbled in spiritualism and in politics, loved music, and tried to educate himself, hampered by ill-health and atrocious luck continually. Now he writes this book in the hope that it will enable him to help his little boy. We hope it will, though frankly, we find parts of the story incredible, and regret that he has given it an *All Quiet On the Western Front* atmosphere which we do not think will help it.

We have tried in vain to discover what it is that Lord Russell is trying to do in *Freedom and Organization, 1814-1914* (Allen & Unwin, 15s.), and we cannot but conclude that it is an entirely unnecessary bit of bookmaking. Lord Russell is a mathematician and a philosopher, but he is no historian, and many of the most important aspects of freedom and organization in the nineteenth century he has altogether omitted. He discusses the principles of legitimacy, nationality, and the growth of imperialism, surveys the teaching of the philosophical radicals in England, and of Marx and other Socialists, and spends 130 pages on democracy and plutocracy in America, giving accounts of the methods by which Vanderbilt, Gould, Rockefeller, Carnegie, and others amassed their millions. But of religion, of science, of letters, and their contribution to freedom Lord Russell has little to say, especially about the first. The story of Congregationalism in the century, for example, can almost entirely be envisaged under the title of Lord Russell's book, and M. Halévy has emphasized how greatly the Free Churches have influenced the political and social life of this country. But Lord Russell's blinkers prevent him from seeing what is so plain to the French historian.

Lord Russell could learn a good deal along these lines from the Master of Balliol's Beckley Lecture, *The Churches and Democracy* (Epworth Press, 2s. 6d.). In it, following Troeltsch, he shows how the principles of Calvinism and the "sects" underlie the predominant social philosophy of Great Britain and the United States. Not only so, but the future of the Churches is threatened by current tendencies:

> If these economic mass forces win the day, and democracy as we have known it, disappears, the Churches will disappear along with it. For this new mass organization of politics depends upon the monopoly of the forces which mould public opinion, and it has no room for the existence of organized minorities.

Mr. R. Liddlesdale Palmer's *English Social History in the Making: The Tudor Revolution* (Nicholson & Watson, 8s. 6d.) is both useful to the scholar and teacher and interesting to the general reader. In it he surrounds contemporary extracts with necessary commentary in order to

describe "The English Social Scene in the 16th Century" (under the headings "Cornfield and Sheepwalk", "Ruffling and Beggarly", and "Midsummer Watch") and "The Expansion of England and the Growth of a World-Wide Trade", in which the exploits of the Merchant Adventurers are summarized. We are glad to see use made of the writings of Robert Crowley, one of the most fascinating figures of the first half of Elizabeth's reign.

A short time ago we noticed with appreciation Mr. Arthur Bryant's *The National Character*. He has now followed it up by *The England of Charles II* (Longmans, 6s.), in which he draws a good deal on the Shakerley MSS on which he is working. Mr. Bryant is very readable, though we cannot say he gives us much confidence in his references to the religions.

The task of reviewing Sir John Marriott's *Modern England (1855-1932)* (Methuen, 16s.)—the final volume of Oman's *History of England*—is almost as difficult as that of writing it must have been. Sir John had to cover not merely affairs at home—political, social, economic—but to describe the events leading up to the War and to keep an eye on the Colonies and India, to say nothing of Ireland. Only one with his long experience of lecturing to popular audiences could have achieved the measure of success which has fallen to him, for he has produced what is on the whole a readable narrative. The book has, however, many defects, the chief being those of selection and proportion. Religion is scarcely mentioned, a fate it shares with literature, science, and art, and there is an undue stress on the constitutional questions on which Sir John is an authority. The style, too, shows traces of haste and of the platform: Mr. B. G. Tilak is described as "a Poona Brahman" on page 491, and "a Poona Brahmin" four pages later; people do not die, but "breathe their last" or "pass away": and what is one to make of rhetorical exaggeration like the following in an historical work:

> From the cradle to the grave the citizen is dogged by the duty of registration; his life is largely occupied by filling in official forms and making returns to Government.

Sir John's politics are well known, and his bias can be allowed for in advance, but in a work of this kind words like "preposterous" (for the Newcastle Programme) are ill-advised, and to call the Nonconformist objection to sectarian teaching at public expense "purely academic" betrays lack of understanding. There are useful bibliographies, and Sir John has drawn largely on his own experiences in Parliament and elsewhere.

Mr. W. E. Williams's *The Rise of Gladstone to the Leadership of the Liberal Party, 1859-1868* (Cambridge, 7s. 6d.) is a good Prize Essay. If Mr. Williams exaggerates the lack of attention paid to the seventh and eighth decades of the 19th Century, nevertheless he has done well to bring out from the Gladstone papers the development of Mr. Gladstone's opinions and his rise to leadership. He might have given a little more attention to the punctuation of the letters he quotes, and when on consecutive pages a phrase is quoted differently an uneasy feeling is aroused. On the whole, however, Mr. Williams has done a promising piece of work.

So much has been written about the Victorian age that it might have been assumed that all its secrets had been revealed and that nothing was left to be said. Mr. Paul Emden's brain-wave has, however, produced a decidedly informing book, and one that we have read with great delight. *Behind the Throne* (Hodder, 15s.) tells of those who made history but whose names do not appear in history books—the Private Secretaries of

Victoria and of Cabinet Ministers. From Stockmar downwards the list includes men whose influence has been guessed at rather than known—Arthur Helps, General Grey, Henry Ponsonby, Arthur Bigge (Lord Stamfordham), and Monty Corry. Then we come to the *entourage* of Edward VII, with Lord Esher and Sir Ernest Cassel and Sir Francis Knollys predominating. A pleasant book, made the more useful by its chronological tables.

Mr. C. R. M. F. Cruttwell's *History of the Great War* (Oxford Press, 15s.) is written *à la Fletcher*, as students will gather without reading his Preface. It is readable, outspoken, confident, and one always knows what the writer thinks, whether one agrees with his views or not—and it is often not. The Principal of Hertford himself took part in the War, and his sketch gains much thereby: he tells the story of much blundering on land and sea, relieved by great heroism and endurance, and he gives full credit to the German army for its magnificent resistance. If only the masses of the people could read a history like this there would be little fear that they would be rushed into war again.

While Mr. Cruttwell is generally on the side of the civilian as against the soldier, he gives full credit to Haig. Thus:

> A captious and jealous rigidity of outlook, a purblind psychology, were inevitably common, as a consequence of their narrow education, among many great captains . . . .

Of Aug. 1918.

> Haig indeed had grown greatly in stature during the last four months, and was still growing. He was the first of any leader, military, or civilian, to foresee the possibility of final victory as inherent in this autumn campaign . . . . These three months reveal Haig as a true strategist, as well as an unrivalled trainer and inspirer of troops.

Vol. VIII (King, 17s. 6d.) of *The New Survey of London Life and Labour* is the third volume devoted to "London Industries". It deals with transport by road and rail, essential services—electricity, gas, water, catering, clerical work, clocks, watches, scientific and musical instruments. The Introduction by Sir H. Llewellyn Smith is a masterpiece of compression. It shows how the most striking feature of the last forty years has been increasing mechanization in every sphere. This, while it has caused unemployment, has not only reduced casual labour, but also reduced the hours of labour and made work less physically exacting and unpleasant (if more monotonous). It has also changed the emphasis from technical skill to steadiness and reliability, and has been one of the forces to shift the centre of the worker's interest from his daily work to his daily leisure—a subject left for treatment in the ninth and last volume.

The Survey is packed with points of interest: the number of clerks, for example, has gone up 255 per cent; the evils of tipping are once again shown; the House of Commons' catering staff is said to go regularly each summer to Weston-super-Mare.

Mr. Baldwin introduces the 1934 edition of *The League Year-Book* (Nicholson & Watson, 12s. 6d.) which is again in the capable hands of Miss Judith Jackson and Commander Stephen King-Hall. This comprehensive reference book on the League should be on the shelves of all public men and of all workers for peace. Its chronicle of events, its report of progress in the I.L.O. and other organizations, its bibliography—all these are indispensable to serious students. We hope that the work will soon be soundly established. A disappointing feature in a disappointing year from the League's point of view is the number of countries in which

the return under "League of Nations Societies" reads "No information supplied for 1933-34."

We know of no better instructor of children than Commander Stephen King-Hall. If children in every land could be nurtured on his teaching there would be much greater hope of world peace. *News for Children* (Nicholson & Watson, 5s.) reprints the weekly letters which appeared in the *Evening Standard* between Feb., 1933, and March, 1934.

Mr. C. E. M. Joad's *Liberty Today* (Watts, 2s. 6d.) is a timely and useful contribution to an all-important subject, despite the writer's anti-religious bias. With ample reference to the present situation in Europe, it discusses first "The Attack" and then "The Defence", concluding with an optimistic, though not too optimistic, survey of the prospects of liberty. The Communist theory that when the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established and the danger of counter-revolution has vanished the State will "wither away" (Lenin's phrase) and the restraints on liberty be removed is far from convincing.

As a foot-note to Mr. Joad's book Mr. G. Coverdale Sharpe's three addresses *Liberty at the Cross-Roads* (Lindsey Press, 4d.) might be read.

The "If I Were Dictator" series (Methuen, 2s. 6d. each) continues to provide entertainment as well as to stimulate thought. So far Mr. Julian Huxley's contribution strikes us as the best, though we disagree so violently with some of his proposals that soon we should be in whatever corresponds to his concentration camps (although he says much of liberty, we fear in practice the opposition would be tightly tethered). The broadcasting problem he solves by "Right" and "Left" Stations, while he secures a socialized state without the methods of doctrinaire socialists. The limitation of profits which he outlines is, we believe, destined to be a not-far-distant and all-important development of our economic system. Mr. St. John Ervine, having hanged all other dictators, finds an exemplar in Moses, to whom he gives a quarter of his space. He, too, makes a plea for liberty, and is specially severe on Mr. Bernard Shaw's extermination theory.

How to Make a Revolution (Hogarth Press, 5s.) is the work of Mr. Raymond Postgate, once a Communist and now a member of the Labour Party. The book first discusses the theories underlying revolution—Marxism, Fascism, Anarchism, Blanquism, *etc.*, and then methods which have been or may be adopted—the General Strike, financial pressure, and armed revolution. After a survey of Communist tactics Mr. Postgate outlines his own method for bringing about revolution. A well-written book which deserves the consideration of all interested in modern society.

Mr. S. B. Whipple is a journalist, and his "Portrait of American Prohibition", *Noble Experiment* (Methuen, 5s.), is painted in vivid colours. Exciting as a novel, the narrative, we cannot but think, at times forsakes history for fiction, though we have heard such incredible stories about America under prohibition that we hesitate to say that anything goes beyond the facts. Mr. Whipple says that 800,000 persons were engaged in bootlegging, and in every way he deems prohibition a failure. His description of the bootlegging business and the gangsters makes an amazing story. Mr. Whipple believes that the only hope of settling the drink question is on a "local community basis"; on any basis it is clear that America will have to grow a respect for law and a public sentiment against corruption which are at present far to seek.

If all the volumes in "The New World Series" (Routledge, 5s.) are equal to *Women in the Civilized State,* it will prove of great service. This

volume, the work of the lady who writes under the name of John Presland, is a well-informed and sympathetic treatment, examining the place of women since the Industrial Revolution, and making suggestions for future progress.

Fraulein Lisbeth Burger's *Other People's Babies* (Constable, 7s. 6d.), translated from the German, is the work of a woman of fine spirit who has been a midwife for 40 years. The book is not for the squeamish, and some of its stories of lust, brutality, and abortion are horrible indeed, though it is well that the facts should be revealed. Fraulein Burger is a devout Catholic, and so opposed to the use of contraceptives. With abundant illustration from her experience she makes out a good case for the Roman view of marriage and divorce.

Congregational preachers of the present-day are greatly afraid of sentiment; it is probably that, in their reaction from the days when tears in pulpit and pew were frequent, they have gone too far and failed to make legitimate and necessary use of emotion. Man is feeling as well as intellect, and good preaching never forgets the fact. How emotion can be used to good purpose may be seen in Mr. Philip Inman's *Oil and Wine* (Chapman & Hall, 8s. 6d.), in which the Managing Governor of the Charing Cross Hospital tells of the great institution over which he presides. Some months ago it was our duty to go over this Hospital, and among all its exhibits none was more interesting than Mr. Inman, whose skilful appeals we had often admired. Mr. Inman is always human, and in the details of administration never forgets the sensitive bodies and souls with which he is dealing. His fine sympathy is seen in this book, packed with stories which will, we venture to think, produce a steady stream of support for the Hospital.

Mr. Roger Dataller writes well in *Oxford Into Coalfield* (Dent, 5s.), though he has found a very easy way of writing a book. Describing his efforts as ambassador of the W.E.A. in the South Yorks coalfield, he jots down descriptions of his experiences, reminiscences of Oxford, an extract from a Preface, or anything that comes into his mind. Despite encouraging features, he concludes that the present generation is not so keen on knowledge as those which preceded it. If there are coalmines with conditions of work like those described on p. 168, they ought to be pilloried. Name, please!

In *The Romance of Labrador* (Hodder, 10s. 6d.) Sir Wilfred Grenfell writes once more of the country to which he has given his life. Now he records the scientific and historic facts about Labrador in fourteen amply illustrated chapters each headed "The Pageant of ———" the Rocks, the Indians, the Vikings, or whatever it may be. He calls it "The *audi alteram partem* of a medical man", and it is packed with information—some of it of an extremely fascinating kind—about birds and beasts and fishes. And, of course, it is intensely human, for Sir Wilfred's passion for helping men shines through his description even of flora and fauna. A delightful book.

In *Back to India* (Livingstone Press, 1s.), the Rev. G. E. and Mrs. Phillips describe their recent journey to L.M.S. stations in India.

Mr. G. R. Scott's *The Common Sense of Nudism* (Laurie, 6s.) is a handbook of nudism, including sun-bathing and sunlight treatment. It gives a history of the movement, a list of Societies, and discusses its advantages and its dangers. The argument generally advanced in favour of nudism—that those who practice the cult are unconscious of their nakedness—is contradicted by the illustrations in this book, especially that of the nudist wedding.

Last Christmas Sir James Jeans boldly took the subject *Through Space and Time* (Cambridge Press, 8s. 6d.) for his Royal Institution Lectures "adapted to a juvenile auditory". We have no means of knowing what the juveniles made of the lectures—we imagine they would sometimes find themselves bewildered and even a little frightened, especially when the lecturer reached the nebulæ—but we can assure the non-scientific reader that he will find them quite fascinating. Sir James has some splendid illustrations to aid him in making a difficult subject clear; we found the lecture on the earth exceptionally good. The others deal with the air, the sky, the moon, the planets, the sun, the stars, and the nebulæ, and few there be who will not learn from them.

Anglican Churches are, generally speaking, a long way behind the Free Churches in Sunday School work, despite the work of Miss Hetty Lee. We are glad to see attempts to modernize Sunday Schools of all sorts, and for that reason welcome Mrs. Shaw's (Ellen A. Elliott) *From Child to Church* (National Society, 3s.), which she calls " Projects in Religious Teaching for Infant, Nursery, and Sunday Schools".

A book to use for older children is the Rev. R. Gladstone Griffith's *Jesus for Everychild* (Skeffington, 2s. 6d.). Mr. Griffith is well known as a modernist, and we are glad he is devoting himself to the adaptation of the Gospel for children.

Mr. Godfrey Pain, who is now in charge of Young People's work at Carrs Lane, Birmingham, has published *Youth at Worship* (Ludgate Circus House, 2s. 6d.) to aid those who lead the worship of Senior Departments and young people's societies generally. The book is really an anthology including poetry and prose drawn from a wide area, with Bible readings.

The Methodist Church has now obtained the help of Mr. E. H. Hayes in its Sunday School department. We have before us the notes he has prepared for 1935. The Primary, Junior, and Intermediate Notes are 3s. 6d., the Beginners' and Morning Notes, 2s. 6d. (Ludgate Circus House).

Mr. Harold Nicholson, the Headmaster of Taunton School, has now given us a sequel to his *Legend of the Horseshoe* (stories adapted from the German. *Legends, Stories, and Fables from the French* is published by the Independent Press (2s.).

Mr. H. L. Gee's *The Cheerful Day* (Methuen, 3s. 6d.) contains snippets for every day of the year culled from many places and from his own experience. A miscellaneous collection which affords both amusement and stimulus.

Another welcome volume in the Loeb series is Vol. II of the *Select Papyri* (Heinemann, 12s. 6d. & 10s.), translated by Prof. A. S. Hunt and Mr. C. C. Edgar. Vol. I dealt with private affairs, the forthcoming volumes will deal with literary papyri. Vol. II is concerned with public business, its 235 items including codes and regulations, public announcements, reports of meetings, contracts, receipts, appointments, judicial business, *etc.* They date from the third century B.C. to the eighth century A.D., and deal with a corresponding range of subjects.

Miss Helen Waddell's *Beasts and Saints* (Constable, 5s.) consists of translations of legends about the beasts and saints from the end of the fourth to the end of the twelfth century. The Desert Fathers, the Saints of the West, and the Saints of Ireland appear in turn. The book is illustrated by Mr. Robert Giddings's woodcuts.

It is greatly to be regretted that Dr. P. S. Allen did not give us that life of Erasmus that he was uniquely qualified to give. While the letters will—for those with Latin—be a κτῆμα ἐς ἀεί yet Dr. Allen's estimate of the life and character of Erasmus would have been a great boon. Failing that, we must perforce be content with *Erasmus: Lectures and Wayfaring Sketches* (Oxford Press, 12s. 6d.), in which some nine papers, read at different times, are collected. We learn about Erasmus's services to learning, his views on Church unity, his relations with his printers and his servant-pupils, as well as about the tri-lingual Colleges of the early 16th century and about Christopher Plantin and his circle. Dr. Allen's learning and enthusiasm begin to win our sympathy for Erasmus, whose timidity and caution have often seemed the more glaring by contrast with the "Here stand I" of Luther.

Hurrah! Mr. T. S. Eliot is—as his *Elizabethan Essays* (Faber, 3s. 6d.) shows—really human, after all, and humorous too, for "Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca" not only contains suggestive criticism but some delightful persiflage. The eleven papers here collected will be found well worth while by all students of Elizabethan literature.

John Galsworthy could do nothing cheap or undignified, but that is not to say he was a poet. Both as novelist and dramatist he found better means of expression than in poetry. Nevertheless we are glad to have his *Collected Poems* (Heinemann, 5s.), which, though it does not include all his poems, includes some never published.

Most of the poems are poems with a purpose and not written for the joy of singing. While it is clear the writer loves flowers and Devon, yet it is generally justice, hatred of cruelty or of war, which impel him to write. The "Frivols" are enjoyable: indeed the second Dedication to a Godson is one of the best things in the collection, though it has an amazingly weak ending. From the rest we quote "Valley of the Shadow" rather than the well-known "The Prayer."

God, I am travelling out to death's sea,
I who exulted in sunshine and laughter,
Dreamed not of dying—death is such waste of me!—
Grant me one prayer: Doom not the hereafter
Of mankind to war, as though I had died not—
I who, in battle, my comrade's arm linking,
Shouted and sang, life in my pulses hot
Throbbing and dancing! Let not my sinking
In dark be for nought, my death a vain thing!
God, let me know it the end of man's fever!
Make my last breath a bugle call, carrying
Peace o'er the valleys and cold hills for ever.

Messrs. Pickering and Inglis have again sent us a set of their diaries (Standard and Vest Pocket Sizes, 1s. to 6s. 6d.) and of their Calendars and Almanack at various prices.

Two of this quarter's novels well worth reading are Mr. Hugh Walpole's *Captain Nicholas* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.) and Miss E. H. Young's *The Curate's Wife* (Cape, 7s. 6d.), though one of the episodes in Mr. Walpole's book we could well have done without, and we wonder if he really believes that every intellectual young man of to-day is brought up on Proust. While both novels leave many of the characters in the air, the downfall of Nicholas and of Mrs. Doubleday is eminently satisfactory. Those who have not read *Jenny Wren* are at a disadvantage in reading *The Curate's Wife,* but they will admire once more Miss Young's gift of analysis, especially of her own sex, as they will Mr. Walpole's power of assembling a family.

Col. T. F. Tweed is to be congratulated on his novel, *Blind Mouths* (Barker, 8s. 6d.), if novel is the correct description of it. Col. Tweed tells an old story in modern dress, that of Christ versus Cæsar, Cæsar being a dictator who has welded a group of Near European States into Danubia, Christ one Johann Zimri, whose magnetic personality and healing power bring peace to many. At last, when Dictator Max is about to plunge the world into War, the mob turn on Zimri, their hero, and Max is killed by his mistress, who has been won by the power of Zimri's life. This is the barest skeleton of a story which has its warning and message to the Europe of to-day, and has its interest for theologians and politicians as well as for readers of fiction.

George A. Birmingham manages to combine humour and thriller in *Two Fools* (Methuen, 7s. 6d.), which can be recommended for a pleasant hour's reading. He really goes too far, however, in saying that a Cabinet Minister and a Vicar, accustomed to see dying and dead people, would find a dead man, discuss what was to be done with the corpse, lift him into a car and carry him some miles, and then discover he was alive.

The landsman will find some of the terminology of Mr. John Masefield's *The Taking of the Gry* (Heinemann, 6s.) beyond him, but he will be carried along by the swing of the narrative of an exciting episode. An admirable map shows the splendid seamanship involved in stealing the *Gry* and bringing her through Drake's unused channel.

Heaven's My Destination (Longmans, 7s. 6d.) shows Mr. Thornton Wilder in a new *rôle*. The book is a "scream," telling as it does the story of one thus described :

> George Brush is my name,
> America's my nation,
> Ludington's my dwelling place,
> And Heaven's my destination.

Brush is a young man with ideals, as "green" as youth can be. He is a Tolstoyan and believes in *ahimsa,* he preaches to all whom he meets and shows how their lives fail to meet the ideal. His theories take him to all kinds of places and land him in strange adventures. He is a perfect ass in many ways and we are obliged to laugh at him, but he is a likeable ass, and he leaves us wondering what Mr. Wilder is getting at.

Miss Jessie Urquhart's *Maryplace* (Nicholson & Watson, 7s. 6d.) shows that she can tell a story. In it she describes an "early Victorian" family of sisters in the Australia she knows so well; Christina, Barbara, Joanna, and Elizabeth are alive, and in each of them the fight between individuality and conventionality is fought out in its own way. It looks, however, as if Miss Urquhart became tired of them before Simon's desertion of Elizabeth : the *dénouement* is too hurried and the last chapters badly written with "Aren't I?", misquoted Scripture, and sentences like

> Elizabeth wondered during the following week was Clyte winning Simon's affection and supposed, with a wry little smile, she was.

Mr. Richard O'Hanlon's *What If This Friend . . . ?* (Cassell, 7s. 6d.) is a promising first novel, which also hurries to its conclusion. It is the story of Vitellius, a Roman patrician in the time of Christ, the unacknowledged son of the Emperor Tiberius, and Governor in Damascus. Jesus of Nazareth never appears directly on the stage, though He is the prevailing influence; indeed, it is at the wedding of Vitellius that He turns the water into wine. Pilate's wife, Simon of Cyrene, and Vitellius's own wife are all strangely moved by the Hebrew prophet. Aretas and Herod play a

prominent part in a story which never flags, and which is well worth reading, though it rather overdoes references to the vices of the period.

Mr. A. F. Webling, whose autobiography, *Something Beyond,* was noticed here three years ago, shows his belief in the reality of communion with the dead in his novel *Deep in the Forest* (Faber, 7s. 6d.). It is an unusual story, a strange mixture of romanticism and mysticism, and it is not helped by its style; instead of taking the joint from the oven the housewife is

> busy with hospitable hands withdrawing savoury meats from their torrid fastnesses.

Mr. J. B. Morton has evidently enjoyed writing *Skylighters* (Heinemann, 7s. 6d.), and one may enjoy reading it, though most of the characters are puppets only. "Skylight" is a new religion which three crooks endeavour to "put across" a religion without creeds or churches or codes, but which is powerful enough to convert one of its originators. Mr. Morton is quite evidently glancing at a modern religious movement and its methods, but that will not prevent people chuckling as they read.

We are afraid we cannot believe the people in Mrs. G. L. Hill's *Amorelle* (Lippincott, 7s. 6d.) are living persons. A girl as sensible as Amorelle might have "fallen for" George, but she would certainly not have failed to inquire about her father's life insurance, his will, and her resources. Nor can we think the life of any church, even in the United States, would be like that of which Reuben Dean was minister.

EDITOR.

The Rev. Norman H. Snaith's *Studies in the Psalter* (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.) originated in an essay which secured the Senior Kennicott Hebrew Scholarship at Oxford in 1925, and was based upon a consideration of Mowinckel's theories respecting the Psalter. The author investigates the origins of *Pss.* 42-99, which he divides into (1) The Elohistic Psalter and its Jehovist Supplement (42-89); (2) the Sabbath Psalms (90-99); and (3) the Coronation Psalms (93, 96-99). The first group come from the period 530-420 B.C. and reflect the party strife in Jerusalem consequent upon the policy of exclusiveness which prevailed from Zerubbabel to Nehemiah, which not only shut out the Samaritans but also had the effect of lowering the status of the Korahite priesthood in the new Temple. The Sabbath and Coronation Psalms are considered in relation to the Sabbath liturgy in the Second Temple. Most of the Psalms under the three heads are examined in some detail and their meaning is illumined by the setting allotted to them. Mr. Snaith adopts the view that Ezra's arrival at Jerusalem is to be dated more than 40 years *after* the arrival of Nehemiah, a change which yields a much more consistent account of the course of events. Moreover, he holds that the Nehemiah-Ezra reforms were based upon *Deut.*, and that, therefore, the Priestly Code sprang out of them instead of furnishing their inspiration. The work is scholarly, and, although small in compass, will be found helpful to the working minister.

There is no need to emphasize the value of any book which comes from the pen of Prof. J. A. Findlay. His illuminating *N.T.* studies have already laid us under a great obligation, and *The Acts of the Apostles* (S.C.M., 3s. 6d.), though comparatively small, and intended for schools, will be read with profit by all who are interested in *N.T.* history and literature. In a General Introduction Prof. Findlay handles most of the problems connected with the character and authorship of *Acts*. He inclines to the view that Luke, the companion of Paul, wrote the first draft of his two books in order

to brief "Theophilus" for Paul's defence before Nero. He holds that Luke, though not a historian in the modern sense, "is more like one than any other *N.T.* writer," having a strong sense of historical development, and being more deeply interested in facts than in ideas. While not professing to give a complete biography of Paul, his portrait of Paul is more life-like than that of Peter, because his knowledge was of a more personal and intimate kind. At many points Prof. Findlay prefers the Western to the Received Text, and on its authority views the decree of Jerusalem as referring exclusively to moral regulations. He rejects the supposition that *Galatians* was written before the Council of Jerusalem, and takes the view that Luke gives us a duplicate account of Paul's second visit to Jerusalem, first from the standpoint of Antioch and afterwards from that of Jerusalem.

In the Commentary the *R.V.* is printed in long sections, followed by explanatory paragraphs in which the material is handled as a connected whole instead of in short snippets. It is exceedingly readable, and while the scholarship is manifest on every page, the most modestly equipped reader from the technical point of view will be able to follow the argument with intelligent appreciation. We are grateful for this book. There are misprints (verse numbers) on page 114.

E. J. Price.

In *Morning and Evening* (Hodder, 6s.) Dr. J. D. Jones has given us another sheaf of his Richmond Hill sermons, and they will be welcomed by many besides his Bournemouth congregation. As always, Dr. Jones gives us preaching with a positive note in it, preaching which never gets far away from the main lines of Christian truth. The sermons in this volume are expository in style, and have that sense of pastoral responsibility which marks all good pulpit work; at the same time they do not forget the tides of thought and spiritual adventure which are flowing everywhere around us. Dr. Jones is alive to what is going on; and if these sermons incline on the whole to the *via media* and moderation, their strength is in their willingness to prove all things and to hold fast that which is good. It is well to have it asserted, as, *e.g.*, in the sermon on "Christian Experience," that Christianity is a historical faith, and rests on facts of history as well as on "experiences": and again, in "The Challenge of Christ," to have it made clear that there are permanent doctrines connected with Christian revelation—that it is not our idea of Christianity, but God's idea of it that matters. Behind all Dr. Jones's preaching there is the force of personal conviction and sincerity.

The legends which grew up around the life of Christ, especially in the medieval period are, many of them, very beautiful: they were well worth gathering together in an accessible form, and Dr. A. S. Rappoport's *Mediaeval Legends of Christ* (Nicholson & Watson, 10s. 6d.) will be of the greatest interest to the general reader as well as to the scholar. This is an admirably designed book, and has a special value now, when there is so much interest in the relation of myth and legend to the Christian story. Dr. Rappoport writes a useful general introduction on the origin of legends, and then in separate chapters gives the chief medieval legends connected with The Virgin Mary, the Nativity, the Flight into Egypt, the Childhood of Christ, the Passion, the Holy Rood, and the Wandering Jew. The book has a valuable bibliography, and a good index. Those to whom the subject is new will find in Dr. Rappoport a fascinating guide; to follow him will correct the easy notion that legends are only a form of superstition, and will make clear how they reflect the faith and love of an age. Now that we are all scientists and have lost the art of the old folk-lore, a book like this may help to remind us that fancy also has her tribute to pay to truth.

The Victory of Christ, by Dom Anscar Vonier, the Abbot of Buckfast (Burns, Oates, 5s.) is an informal theological study of the Atonement, viewed as Christ's victory over sin; and of the ecclesiastical and personal implications of the doctrine. Really it is a statement of the Catholic belief, and at no point does it stray from the accepted path. The authorities are the Fathers, the Councils of the Church, and St. Thomas Aquinas. In their light the very numerous quotations from the *N.T.* are interpreted. All this has the very great advantage of a definite position: but theology to-day should surely take some account of later scholarship, and of Biblical criticism. All this might never have been; and instead we are pointed to Roman orthodoxy of the centre. Perhaps Dom Vonier's method is right. At any rate, there is a profound religious sense in the book, and one cannot read it without a deep feeling of gratitude to the author.

Miss Sylvia Masterman's *The Origins of International Rivalry in Samoa* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.) covers the history of the Samoan islands from 1845-1884, the period during which Samoa became involved in the commercial and political rivalries of Great Britain, Germany, and America. Unhappily for the Samoans their islands are a strategic point on the Pacific highways, and the rivalry of the great white peoples, and its results for Samoa, is not a pleasant story to read. Miss Masterman gives a very sympathetic account of missionary influence in Samoa, and particularly of the work of the L.M.S., which has been the finest saving influence on these island folk. Speaking of criticisms of the missionaries, Miss Masterman says, "Rather do they deserve unstinted thanks for preserving the native races from annihilation." This book, together with Dr. Keesing's *Modern Samoa,* recently reviewed here, will give the reader most valuable information on the whole Samoan question, and it is to be most heartily recommended to all students of missionary work.

A. T. S. James.

Dr. J. M. E. McTaggart was the outstanding philosopher of the last generation at Cambridge, and is well known for his view that Reality is a society of eternal spirits bound together by love. *Philosophical Studies* (Arnold, 12s. 6d.), a collection of his scattered philosophical papers, has been skilfully arranged by Dr. S. V. Keeling to lead the reader to this conclusion through a series of special positions on which it depends. Thus the papers on Personality and the Individualism of Value, which defend the human spirit against absorption in two different kinds of super-personal objectivity, and the two papers on time and eternity, precede the full exposition of McTaggart's philosophy in the last three chapters. These form an admirable popular summary of his position, less specialized than *Some Dogmas of Religion,* and less difficult for the layman than *The Nature of Existence.* I confess that McTaggart's adroit use of the terms and methods of the newer Cambridge philosophy against their authors (admirably elucidated by Dr. Keeling in his introduction, and particularly well illustrated in the paper on Personality) fills me with unregenerate satisfaction.

The general theme in Mr. Thomas Whittaker's *Reason: A Philosophical Essay, with Historical Illustrations* (Cambridge Press, 10s. 6d.) is not easy to disentangle, except that the essays all bear the impress of the same learned and inquiring mind. But they are all directly or indirectly concerned with the nature and the scope of reason. The author's main thesis is that the conflict between empiricism and rationalism is to be overcome through the conception of an empirical teleology with a transcendent reference. This, at least, is the bearing of the historical essays: in the

essay which gives its rather ambitious name to the collection the same end is attempted, less successfully, by a distinction between discursive and intuitive reason. The author's gifts run to exposition and historical presentation rather than to philosophical analysis, and as descriptive studies in their own right the historical essays would form a most useful introduction to the writings of Comte, Mill, Schopenhauer, and Vico: indeed, the essay on Vico should do much to stimulate a revival of interest in him which, in view of his importance, is badly overdue. I hardly feel the same confidence in the author when he turns from the history of philosophy to philosophy itself. A. Boyce Gibson.

NEW EDITIONS, REPRINTS, *ETC.*

Dr. L. Maclean Watt has published a revised and augmented edition of his very useful *Minister's Manual* (Allenson, 5s.) and Dr. Kenneth E. Kirk an abridged edition of his Bampton Lectures *The Vision of God* (Longmans, 7s. 6d.). In the "Torch Library" (S.C.M., 1s.) we have Dr. H. R. Mackintosh's *The Christian Apprehension of God.* Lt.-Col. W. H. Turton's *The Truth of Christianity* (Wells Gardner, 2s.) is now in its twelfth edition, and Dean Inge's Warburton Lectures *God and the Astronomers,* recently reviewed in these pages, is re-issued at 5s. (Longmans). Mr. F. J. Gillman's *The Torch of Praise* (N.A.S.U., 1s.) is a "historical companion" to the revised edition of *The Fellowship Hymn Book.* Students of political philosophy who have found 30s. beyond them for the English translation of M. Elie Halévy's *Growth of Philosophic Radicalism* will be grateful for the cheap edition (Faber, 12s. 6d.). Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Hammond's *The Bleak Age* (Longmans, 3s. 6d.), is based on *The Age of the Chartists* and is published in the "Swan Library." A 5s. edition of Emil Ludwig's *Kaiser Wilhelm II* now appears in Putnam's "Black and White Library," while among the new "Everyman" volumes (Dent, 2s.) are Dryden's *Poems* and Heine's *Prose and Poetry.* In the "Fountain Library" (Methuen, 2s. 6d.) we have Mrs. Pearl Buck's *East Wind: West Wind,* in the "World's Classics" Constance Holme's *Things Which Belong* (Oxford Press, 2s.), and in the "Rose and Crown" Library (Faber, 5s.) Mr. C. E. M. Joad's *Under the Fifth Rib.* Commander Stephen King-Hall's *Bunga-Bunga* (Nicholson & Watson), first published two years ago, now appears at 3s. 6d.

LECTURES, PAMPHLETS, *ETC.*

First must come General Smuts's Rectorial Address at Glasgow, *Freedom* (Maclehose, 2s.) and Prof. Bethune-Baker's *Unity and Truth in the Church of England* (Cambridge Press, 1s.). Mr. A. L. Rowse's *The Question of the House of Lords* (Hogarth Press, 1s. 6d.) is also valuable. A useful series, "Tracts for the Times" (Livingstone Press, 4d.), opens with E. H. Jeffs, *Christian Missions,* McEwan Lawson, *Undying Flame,* A. Victor Murray, *Are Missions Up to Date?* (very alive), and B. C. Plowright, *Cæsar or Christ?* Miss Joyce Reason's *The Dog in the Manger* (Independent Press, 6d.) is a Christmas booklet which could be used with Christmas greetings.

ALSO RECEIVED.

C. M. Chavasse. *A Letter from the Catacombs.* Lutterworth. 9d. The "Golden Lectures" on *I Pet.*
W. M. Robertson. *The Bible at the Bar.* Pickering. 1s. 6d. & 1s.
William Bottomley. *The Man the Church Has Hidden.* Lindsey Press. 1s. 6d. A rationalizing life of Jesus, "a man who was really a man."
K. L. Parry. *The Mystery of Godliness.* Stockwell. 2s. 6d. Ten sermons well worth reading, dedicated to the congregation of Chorlton Road Church, Manchester.
F. Luke Wiseman. *The New Methodism.* Epworth Press. 1s. Gleanings made by Mr. H. Murray from addresses during Mr. Wiseman's Presidential year.
Dr. A. E. Garvie and others. *Our Dead, Where Are They?* Stockwell. 1s.
C. W. Daniel. *Freedom from Inward Conflict.* Daniel. 2s. 6d.

EARL OF LYTTON. *Old Treasure.* Allen & Unwin. 3s. 6d. A Bible Anthology.
The Keswick Convention, 1934. Pickering. 4s. & 2s. 6d.
H. VICTOR JONES. *Golden Ballast.* Epworth Press. 2s. 6d. Twenty-two Science Talks for Children.
R. H. BOYD. *The Tiger Tamed.* Pickering. 2s.
E. A. BLAND. *"O Carry Me Back!".* Pickering. 2s. 6d.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS.

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review (Oct.). The Rev. B. A. Barber has an appreciation of the Rev. John Telford, who is retiring from the post of Methodist Editor. Mr. Telford himself writes on Dr. J. S. Simon's history of Methodism. A Congregational contributor is the Rev. A. M. Chirgwin ("The Future of Bechuanaland") and among other articles are Mr. E. E. Kellett's "The Puns in Milton," the Rev. T. A. Bailey's "The Problem of the Fourth Gospel," and Prof. Atkinson Lee's "The Freudian Illusion."

The Hibbert Journal (Oct.). Prof. Adams Brown opens with "Broader Issues Raised at York," in which he discusses questions of union in the light of the Liverpool Cathedral Controversy. There is an article on "The Problem of Christian Origins" by Dr. Alfred Loisy, and then Dr. Vincent Taylor subjects Dr. Loisy's position to devastating criticism. The Editor writes on Bergson, and among other contributors are Profs. H. B. Alexander, J. H. Muirhead, and Nicholas Berdyaev. Prof. G. Dawes Hicks surveys philosophical literature. Mr. F. S. Marvin has a more sympathetic study of the Oxford Groups than we should have expected, and Miss M. B. Whiting writes on Charles Lamb.

The Baptist Quarterly (Oct.). The main articles are the Rev. F. R. Schofield's "True Nonconformity," Prin. P. W. Evans's "The Relevance of the Ministry," and the Rev. W. T. Bowie's "William Carey." Some interesting letters about Stepney College are printed.

The Modern Churchman (Oct.-Dec.). The October number is the Report of the Conference on "The Bible and the Modern Man." There is an imposing list of contributors, including the Bishop of Birmingham, Dr. Inge, Dr. Raven, Dr. Bethune-Baker, Dr. Streeter and Dr. Major. Free Church contributors are Mr. H. G. Wood and Dr. W. F. Lofthouse. In the November number there is a sermon by the Bishop of Birmingham on "The Divine Creative Method," while five pages are given to the Modern Churchman's statement on Marriage Law Reform.

The Church Quarterly Review (Oct.). There are some good articles in this number. Dr. Oesterley discusses "Messianic Prophecy and Extra-Israelite Beliefs," Dr. Sparrow Simpson writes on "Our Lord's Command to Perpetuate the Eucharist," Dr. G. D. Henderson on "Externals of Church Worship and Church Government in Scotland under Charles II," and Dr. F. H. Hallock on "Church and State in Tertullian." The longest article is Canon Maynard Smith's "Lollardy," which contains a good deal of information but seems tendencious. Canon Smith has a mention of Dr. Powicke's name in which he both spells the name wrongly and denies him his title.

The Expository Times (Oct.-Dec.). In these numbers Dr. Vincent Taylor has begun a series on "Some Outstanding New Testament Problems." Dr. G. F. Barber discusses "Punishments in Ethics and Theology." The "Heretics" discussed are Arius (Dr. W. Emery Barnes), Nestorius (Dr. G. D. Henderson), and Socinus (Dr. W. D. Nevin). Among other articles that should be noted are the contributions on recent foreign theology, and those in the series "Things Most Surely Believed" (by Drs. A. E. Garvie, H. Wheeler Robinson, and C. H. Dodd).

The Christian Quarterly (Oct.). We are glad to see that this *Quarterly* has survived its first year and is to continue. The price is now to be 1s. per issue. The magazine is only slight, but it lays the foundations of something bigger.

The British Journal of Inebriety (Oct.). Dr. J. Y. Dent contributes a very interesting paper on the use of apomorphine in the treatment of anxiety states, especially in regard to alcoholism. Dr. G. A. Stephens writes on "Industry and Inebriety."

Individual Psychology Pamphlets. (No. 13.) This is the second number devoted to "Individual Psychology and Sexual Difficulties." It contains two lectures by Dr. Alfred Adler, and one by the late Dr. F. G. Crookshank.

Social Service Review (Sept.-Nov.). Among the chief contributions are Miss N. Adler's "The New Shops Act," Miss Margaret Cross's Youth and Health" and Mr. Harry Vickerstaff's "Unemployment from the point of view of the Unemployed."

Religion in Education (Oct.). The Rev. Stephen Neill writes on "Christian Leadership," Mr. D. C. Somervell on "God in History," the Archbishop of York on "The Place of Religion in Education," and the Editor on "How Teachers may Equip themselves." This is a journal which all those engaged in religious teaching in day schools will find specially useful.

The International Review of Missions (Oct.). An extremely good number. The Rev. William Paton writes on "Christian Missions and Religious Liberty," Dr. Richard Roberts on Japan, the Rev. T. W. D. James discusses "The Ministerial Missionary in China," Miss F. Allshorn "Corporate Life on a Mission Station," and Miss F. Mackenzie "Corporate Living and Missionary Witness," A specially informing contribution is Dr. J. Witte's "The German Faith Movement."

The Evangelical Quarterly (Oct.). In "Survivals of a Pagan Cult" Dr. C. B. Lewis argues that the songs of the troubadours are relics of the worship of Cybele. Two other good articles are Dr. G. Besselaar's "Calvinism and National Reaction," and Dr. Imre Révész's "Hungarian Reformed Christianity and Calvinism," while the Rev. E. K. Simpson's "Spurgeon's Intellectual Qualities" is very readable.

Religion in Life (Autumn). This Quarterly comes from the American Methodists and is published by the Abingdon Press ($2 yearly plus postage). Among the most interesting contributions in this issue are Dr. John Baillie's "The Office of the Ministry," Dr. Lynn Harold Hough's "Thinking in a Shaking World," Dr. Fort Newton's "The Reply of the Preacher," Dr. R. H. Stafford's "Institution or Movement?" and Dr. F. W. Norwood's "A Look at the World."

The Yale Review (Autumn). Another valuable number, in which Mr. Walter Lippman writes on "Recovery by Trial and Error" and Prof. R. B. Perry on "The Alleged Failure of Democracy." Mr. Carleton Beals and Mr. E. K. James write on "Students Carry Guns" (South America) and M. Paul Reynaud on "Political Currents in France." Mr. Shane Leslie edits some letters of Henry Adams, Mr. Stephen Leacock writes on "Charles Dickens and Mark Twain," and Mrs. Virginia Woolf on "A Conversation about Art."

The Colgate-Rochester Divinity School Bulletin. A great deal of this number is occupied by an important article on "The Baptists and Roger Williams" by Mr. C. H. Moehlman. Another important contribution is Mr. Thomas Wearing's "Preaching Material in Contemporary Literature."

The Review and Expositor (Oct.). The Rev. J. B. Weatherspoon writes on Spurgeon, and Dr. E. J. Trueblood on "Social Elements in the Christian Religion." There are important articles on pastoral work, while two English contributors are Dr. Rushbrooke ("The Sovereignty of God") and the Rev. H. J. Flowers ("Lamentations").

The Harvard Theological Review (July). Mr. Andrew Banning criticises Professor Brightman's Theory of a Limited God, and Mr. J. A. Montgomery writes on "The Ethiopic Text of *Acts*."

The Anglican Theological Review (Oct.). Prof. H. A. Saunders has an informing article on "Recent Text Studies in the New Testament." Dr. Monod's "Christianity and the Value of Time" answers the question "Does Every Christian Philosophy Centre in the Affirmation of the Absolute Value of Time?" Another article of value is Mr. P. S. Kramer's "The Place of Gnosticism in the History of Christian Thought."